

20010709.qrp v02_n245.qrl.20010709

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 19:03:10 EDT

From: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: QRP-L digest 2245

QRP-L Digest 2245

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) [102002] Totally Nonscientific Poll Results
by Kenneth Hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
- 2) [102003] FS paddles
by ac5ez@webtv.net (Larry)
- 3) [102004] Re: ZM-2 Tuner Help
by N1EU <n1eu@yahoo.com>
- 4) [102005] qrpp on 6 meters
by "Paul Craig" <n3ysi@rcn.com>
- 5) [102006] Soldering iron info wanted
by "Bob Tellefsen" <n6wg@earthlink.net>
- 6) [102007] Mountain Lake VA Activation
by Stephan Greene <sgreene@patriot.net>
- 7) [102008] Re: qrpp on 6 meters
by "Bill, N4QA" <n4qa@hotmail.com>
- 8) [102009] Summer Homebrew Contest
by Randy Foltz <rfoltz@turbonet.com>
- 9) [102010] Re: Summer Homebrew Contest
by "Brian Murrey" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
- 10) [102011] Re: qrpp on 6 meters
by KB7WW Art Moe <kb7ww@uswest.net>
- 11) [102012] Cub fox run on 7/10
by "Tony Parks" <robert.parks11@gte.net>
- 12) [102013] RE: P-TiCk last call
by "Jay Bromley" <w5jay@alltel.net>
- 13) [102014] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
by "Don Wilhelm" <w3fpr@arrl.net>
- 14) [102015] Re: Summer Homebrew Contest
by Randy Foltz <rfoltz@turbonet.com>
- 15) [102016] What is a CC number??
by "TC Dufresne" <tdufresne@neb.rr.com>
- 16) [102017] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
by Pete Burbank <plburbank@kih.net>
- 17) [102018] Re: What is a CC number??
by "Brian Murrey" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
- 18) [102019] RE: 10 Meter QRP Ideas Needed
by W2SH@aol.com
- 19) [102020] Cub Fox Pelt-O-Rama! W0MC Cub Fox Announcement

- by "Jerry McCollom" <w0mc@club-pre.org>
- 20) [102021] Re: Redhot NC20 TX offset problem
by "Dave Fifield" <ad6a@earthlink.net>
- 21) [102022] Appalachian Trail in PA Today
by "Ron Polityka" <wb3aal@fast.net>
- 22) [102023] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
- 23) [102024] Re: Solar Panel and Battery question
by Mark Brueggemann <markb@abq.com>
- 24) [102025] Re: [101863] Solar Panel and Battery question
by "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>
- 25) [102026]
by "Mike Morrell" <morrellm@ameritech.net>
- 26) [102027] Re: Appalachian Trail in PA Today
by RLemmel@aol.com
- 27) [102028] RE: REFLECTIONS II
by "Lofstead, Jerry" <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>
- 28) [102029] RE: toroid cores , thanks and status
by "Patrick Cummins" <pcummins@misnet.com>
- 29) [102030] Need antenna guru help
by "Patrick Cummins" <pcummins@misnet.com>
- 30) [102031] New CW testing
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
- 31) [102032] Small Wonders Labs PSK-30 coming soon to a theatre near you
by PDouglas12@aol.com
- 32) [102033] Re: Anyone remember
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 33) [102034] Re: New CW testing
by Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>
- 34) [102035] Re: QRP-L???
by "Randall Jouett" <rules@bellsouth.net>
- 35) [102036] Fort Tuthill '01
by "Bob Hightower" <nk7m@extremezone.com>
- 36) [102037] qsl Vendors
by Bcieslak@ra.rockwell.com
- 37) [102038] Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 38) [102039] Re: Need antenna guru help
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 39) [102040] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
by Shephed@aol.com
- 40) [102041] Re: New CW testing
by Shephed@aol.com
- 41) [102042] RE: New CW testing
by "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
- 42) [102043] Re: New CW testing
by "ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
- 43) [102044] Re: Need antenna guru help

by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
44) [102045] RE: New CW testing
by "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
45) [102046] Re: New CW testing
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
46) [102047] RE: REFLECTIONS II
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
47) [102048] cw test
by ac5ez@webtv.net (Larry)
48) [102049] RE: REFLECTIONS II
by "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
49) [102050] Re: Need antenna guru help
by "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
50) [102051] Re: qsl Vendors
by Russ Dow <n7dw@pacbell.net>
51) [102052] RE: Antenna to Freespace Impedance Matching
by "Lofstead, Jerry" <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>
52) [102053] RE: New CW testing
by "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
53) [102054] RE: REFLECTIONS II
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
54) [102055] Re: REFLECTIONS II
by George Franklin <w0av@juno.com>
55) [102056] Re: cw test
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
56) [102057] RE: REFLECTIONS II
by "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>
57) [102058] Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
58) [102059] Re: REFLECTIONS II
by "Brian" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
59) [102060] QRP-L?
by Kenneth Hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
60) [102061] Need antenna guru help - more info concerning
by "Patrick Cummins" <pcummins@misnet.com>
61) [102062] Re: CW Test
by Harris Keith E CONT CNIN <harris_k@crane.navy.mil>
62) [102063] Re: New CW testing
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
63) [102064] QRP Wall Wart
by lhlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
64) [102065] RE: Antenna to Freespace Impedance Matching
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
65) [102066] Re: cw test
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
66) [102067] Re: New CW testing
by "Richard Brummer, K2JQ" <k2jq@bestweb.net>
67) [102068] Re: CW Test

by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
68) [102069] Re: Mode 516 Suggestions
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
69) [102070] RE: New CW testing
by "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
70) [102071] Monday's AT Trip
by "Ron Polityka" <wb3aal@fast.net>
71) [102072] RE: New CW testing
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
72) [102073] Re: REFLECTIONS II
by "Mike Branca" <w3irz@att.net>
73) [102074] Ten Tecs New Toy
by Fred Lesnick <flesnick@tbaytel.net>
74) [102075] RE: REFLECTIONS II
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
75) [102076] Re: REFLECTIONS II
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
76) [102077] Conjugate matching
by ac5ez@webtv.net (Larry)
77) [102078] Re: Need antenna guru help - more info concerning
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
78) [102079] Re: New CW testing
by "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>
79) [102080] FOC Web Site...
by "Stephane Collas" <Stephane.Collas@wanadoo.fr>
80) [102081] Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting
by "Rod Cerkoney, NØRC" <rod@n0rc.com>
81) [102082] Re: FOC Web Site...
by "w8diz" <w8diz@fpqrp.com>
82) [102083] Re: New CW testing
by "blinn" <blinn@smgazette.com>
83) [102084] Re: New CW testing
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>

Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 19:01:32 -0400
From: Kenneth Hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102002] Totally Nonscientific Poll Results
Message-ID: <3B48E64C.CEFEE558@wfu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Gang--

I received 22 responses as to how far the nearest RS was. Numerical

responses are below:

Minutes	Responses
3	2
5	5
10	4
15	5
20	2
25	0
30	3

And Paul GOODP who bemoaned the fact that RS closed all their stores in Britain. I tried to convince him that taking the Concorde, he could get to an RS in NYC in about 5 hours (HIHI).

Pretty impressive, even for a totally nonscientific poll: over 63% of an audience that has regular need of their stuff is within 15 minutes or less of a store. Suggests that it is still useful to offer RS part nos. for circuits when such exist.

Disclaimer: not a referendum on RS, its sales personnel, stock, advertising, customer service, or utility. Simply a consideration of how accessible they are to us qrp's who are always tinkering.

73

Ken KG4FGC

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 18:18:51 -0500 (CDT)
From: ac5ez@webtv.net (Larry)
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102003] FS paddles
Message-ID: <2039-3B48EA5B-563@storefull-113.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
Content-Disposition: Inline
Content-Type: Text/Plain; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7Bit
MIME-Version: 1.0 (WebTV)

The brass racer has been sold
Thanks all

K1zw
Larry
Qcwa

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 16:39:19 -0700 (PDT)
From: N1EU <n1eu@yahoo.com>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu, wo7t@juno.com
Subject: [102004] Re: ZM-2 Tuner Help
Message-ID: <20010708233919.16667.qmail@web14603.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Here you go Mark:

End-fed:
Connect antenna wire to RED terminal. Counterpoise
wire to BLACK terminal. Link switch away from GND.
(Link switch is set to GND only for coax fed
antennas).

Balanced Feedline:
Connect two feedline conductors to RED and BLACK.
Link switch away from GND.

GL/73,
Barry N1EU

Do You Yahoo!?
Get personalized email addresses from Yahoo! Mail
<http://personal.mail.yahoo.com/>

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 20:48:15 -0400
From: "Paul Craig" <n3ysi@rcn.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102005] qrpp on 6 meters
Message-ID: <000f01c10810\$d806ae60\$32fca4d8@oemcomputer>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Folks,

I rarely post to this list and use the delete key on a regular basis but
after receiving the following from my nephew N3DB in Maryland I thought you
all might be interested.

<snip>

I worked

Bruce K2RTH on May 12 under similar circumstances - I was making cw QSOs with FLA stations and I heard him call me after the end of one. Turns out that he was running 1 mw for that QSO, and he told me so during it. I emailed him and he informed me that he had made one other 1 mw QSO, and that I was his second. I was very pleased to be able to work him at that power level, and sent him a QSL (even though I already had the grid), which he returned.

Yesterday, I had just about given up CQing (it was just a run of the mill single-hop E opening to the south) when WB4YCN replied to me. We had a short QSO, and I signed SK ... I heard Bruce sending his callsign, extremely weak but audible. I almost thought I was hearing things, so I sent "K2RTH ? agn" and sure enough it was him. Based on his usual signal strength here (S9 plus) when the east coast is working DX, I recognized he was QRP, but didn't realize just how much so he really was until he sent me this email.

<snip>

From: <K2RTH@aol.com>

To: <n3db@radix.net>; <Wa3hmk@aol.com>; <w3ep@arrl.org>

Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 12:40 AM

Subject: Record QRP QSO 6/19/01

> Dave:

> I think we have a record breaking QSO. I got back on about 5 minutes
> later with KW to tell you but you were gone. Thanks for the random QSO on
cw

> and my 319 report, of course you were very loud here 599++.

> After we finished our cw qso I measured my output power with an HP432A
> power meter and I was running 90 microwatts output = .000090 Watts !!!!!

> A crystal oscillator will produce 10 mw, more then 100 times more
power.

> I double checked for leakage or any other way I may have been running more
> power and there was none, the measurement is correct and I believe
possible

> the lowest power ever used for a ham radio QSO with or without out a
sked.

<snip>

> What I am using is the 4 mw watt output which I then feed thru a 16 dB
> precision microwave attenuator to the antenna. The receiver also has the
16

> attenuator in front of it. I measure the output at the station antenna
> input, the actual power at the antenna is about 80 microwatts after coax
loss

> through 100' of 1/2" heliax.

> After our QSO I worked W3CMP FN10 also on random on cw, we also had a
> solid QSO with my getting 519 report, he was 599 with 5 watts.

> Thanks again for our second QRPP QSO(first with 1.0 mw), and dont

think I
> will try with less power, but could be...
>
> 73, Bruce K2RTH EL95TQ Miami, Florida

I was skeptical at first but it seems as if K2RTH knows what he is talking about. I may just have to get a 6 meter converter one of these days.

72 and keep it low,
Paul N3YSI
Quakertown,PA

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 18:14:04 -0700
From: "Bob Tellefsen" <n6wg@earthlink.net>
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102006] Soldering iron info wanted
Message-ID: <MABBJOEABOILMKCJCLFCOENCCIAA.n6wg@earthlink.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Recently there were some posts regarding temperature controlled soldering irons, I think by Weller and Hakko.

Didn't pay much attention at the time, as mine was working fine, right?
Guess what, it isn't working any more so need to replace.

Can anyone point me to any of these previous posts?

Tried to find them in QRP-L archives, but could only find archives through 2000. Nothing for 2001.

73, Bob N6WG

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 21:19:41 -0400 (EDT)
From: Stephan Greene <sgreene@patriot.net>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Cc: NoVAQRP List <NoVaQRP@topica.com>
Subject: [102007] Mountain Lake VA Activation
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10107082116510.16452-1000000@tzion.greene.lan>
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Sun, 8 Jul 2001, Stephan Greene wrote:

> Photos and comments will be up in a day or so at <http://www.00ff00e.com>
> (don't bother looking before Monday).

Went faster than I could've hoped (digital cameras are fun!).

<http://www.00ff00e.com/morephotos/mtnlakeqrp2001/>

72

Steve

Stephan A. Greene sgreene@patriot.net
HAM: KA1LM@amsat.org QRP-L #232 Grid FM18hx 38 59'83.33"N 77 23'6.15"W

Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 21:29:52 -0400
From: "Bill, N4QA" <n4qa@hotmail.com>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [102008] Re: qrpp on 6 meters
Message-ID: <F63Q6shalxyPyF1BcI30000c749@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

Wow !

But, just for clarity...was the subject QSO accomplished with 80 microwatts
or 1000 microwatts from the one end of the path ?

Either way, sorta makes all of my 80 meter CW QSOs using the Warbler running
one watt look sort of QRO :)

Worked all the way into Point Pleasant, WV this evening...

73.

Bill, N4QA

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 18:30:54 -0700
From: Randy Foltz <rfoltz@turbonet.com>
To: qrpl_post <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102009] Summer Homebrew Contest
Message-ID: <3B49094E.7C34E999@turbonet.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sunday July 15, 2001 is the QRP ARCI Summer Homebrew Sprint. It is yet another chance to do some QRP contesting. The special wrinkle to this contest is the extra points you get for using a homebrew rig. If you built it, it is homebrew.

Here is a summary of the contest.

Date/Time: July 15, 2001, 2000 Z through 2400 Z. A 4 hour sprint. HF CW only.

Exchange: RST, State/Province/Country, ARCI member number of power if you are not a member.

QSO Points:

Member = 5 points

Non-member different continent = 4 points

Non-member same continent = 2 points

Multiplier:

SPC (State/Province/Country) total for all bands. The same station may be worked on more than one band for QSO Points and SPC credit.

Power Mult:

0 to 250 mW = x15

over 250 mW to 1 W = x10

over 1 W to 5 W = x7

over 5 W = x1

Bonus Points for homebrew gear (per band):

Add 2,000 points for using HB transmitter

Add 3,000 points for using HB receiver

Add 5,000 points for using HB transceiver

Final Score:

QSO Points X Total SPC X Power Multiplier + Bonus Points

Suggested Frequencies: The usual 80, 40, 20, 15, and 10 m

QRP ones.

How to submit your entry:

Entry includes a copy of logs and summary sheet. A summary sheet is available at
<http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/arcisums.htm>

Include legible name, call, address, and ARCI number, if any.

Entry may be All-band, Single-, High-, or Low-Band.

Entry must be received within 30 days of contest date.

Highest power used will determine the power multiplier.

After the contest you may send your report by visiting
<http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/form.htm>

Check the web page at
<http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/highclm.htm> to see what others have said and claimed as their scores.

Snail mail entries go to
Randy Foltz
809 Leith St.
Moscow, ID 83843

See you on Sunday!

--

73,
Randy, K7TQ
QRP ARCI Contest Chairman

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 20:40:12 -0500
From: "Brian Murrey" <bmmurray@amexol.net>
To: <rfoltz@turbonet.com>, "QRP-L" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102010] Re: Summer Homebrew Contest
Message-ID: <004301c10818\$1cc69c20\$86532bd1@iquest.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

If I use my TT2 for the transmitter, and my Norcal 40A for the receiver....do I get 5000 bonus points or do I get 2000 for the TT2 and 5000 for the Norcal? <grin>

73

----- Original Message -----

From: "Randy Foltz" <rfoltz@turbonet.com>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2001 8:30 PM

Subject: Summer Homebrew Contest

> Sunday July 15, 2001 is the QRP ARCI Summer Homebrew
> Sprint. It is yet another chance to do some QRP
> contesting. The special wrinkle to this contest is the
> extra points you get for using a homebrew rig. If you built
> it, it is homebrew.
>
> Here is a summary of the contest.
>
> Date/Time: July 15, 2001, 2000 Z through 2400 Z. A 4 hour
> sprint. HF CW only.
>
> Exchange: RST, State/Province/Country, ARCI member number of
> power if you are not a member.
>
> QSO Points:
> Member = 5 points
> Non-member different continent = 4 points
> Non-member same continent = 2 points
>
> Multiplier:
> SPC (State/Province/Country) total for all bands. The same
> station may be worked on more than one band for QSO Points
> and SPC credit.
>
> Power Mult:
> 0 to 250 mW = x15
> over 250 mW to 1 W = x10
> over 1 W to 5 W = x7
> over 5 W = x1
>
> Bonus Points for homebrew gear (per band):
> Add 2,000 points for using HB transmitter
> Add 3,000 points for using HB receiver
> Add 5,000 points for using HB transceiver
>

> Final Score:
> QSO Points X Total SPC X Power Multiplier + Bonus Points
>
> Suggested Frequencies: The usual 80, 40, 20, 15, and 10 m
> QRP ones.
>
> How to submit your entry:
>
> Entry includes a copy of logs and summary sheet. A summary
> sheet is available at
> <http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/arcisums.htm>
>
> Include legible name, call, address, and ARCI number, if
> any.
>
> Entry may be All-band, Single-, High-, or Low-Band.
>
> Entry must be received within 30 days of contest date.
>
> Highest power used will determine the power multiplier.
>
> After the contest you may send your report by visiting
> <http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/form.htm>
>
> Check the web page at
> <http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/highclm.htm> to see
> what others have said and claimed as their scores.
>
> Snail mail entries go to
> Randy Foltz
> 809 Leith St.
> Moscow, ID 83843
>
> See you on Sunday!
>
> --
> 73,
> Randy, K7TQ
> QRP ARCI Contest Chairman
>

Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 18:43:15 -0700
From: KB7WW Art Moe <kb7ww@uswest.net>
To: n3ysi@rcn.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102011] Re: qrpp on 6 meters
Message-ID: <3B490C33.EED8AD15@uswest.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul Craig wrote:

>
> Folks,
> I rarely post to this list and use the delete key on a regular basis but
> after receiving the following from my nephew N3DB in Maryland I thought you
> all might be interested.
>
> <snip>
> I worked
> Bruce K2RTH on May 12 under similar circumstances - I was making cw QSOs
> with FLA stations and I heard him call me after the end of one. Turns out
> that he was running 1 mw for that QSO, and he told me so during it. I
> emailed him and he informed me that he had made one other 1 mw QSO, and that
> I was his second. I was very pleased to be able to work him at that power
> level, and sent him a QSL (even though I already had the grid), which he
> returned.
>

Hey gang, until you have worked a intense 6 meter opening you will never know what low power can do. Last night I sat here and worked stations in central California and Nevada for about 1.5 hours running 2.5 watts out through 180 feet of coax about 1.5 watts at the antenna. Rag chewed with NN7K in Sparks, a life time friend (almost 60 years we grew up together) for 20 minutes. He told me that sig never went below s9. He runs a beacon on 6 meters with 2 watts and during "E" season it in up here many days. As I have said before during F2 I have worked VE1 W1,2,3 with 10 MW all of these contacts last night and on F2 were SSB !!!!! Yes, I have a fair antenna up in the air. Its 25 year old KLM 11 e1 on a 28 foot boom with the LPY feed about the same gain as a new M sq. 7 element. Its very interesting to set the AGC to fast and watch the meter never move off the S9+60 peg during normal speech, only dropping back when a station pauses.

I know that one of the list members is working on a transverter for 6 and I hope you bury him in orders. there are some Grid squares that I need where there is no activity in and some of you live in them.

Cu on 6

KB7WW

6 meter WAS WAC WAJA

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 20:49:46 -0500
From: "Tony Parks" <robert.parks11@gte.net>
To: <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102012] Cub fox run on 7/10
Message-ID: <000f01c10819\$70906380\$5285113f@3dse0>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello fellow fox hunters,

Jerry, WOMC, and I, KB9YIG, will be making every effort to hand out lots of pelts on Tuesday, July 10, (0200-0400 Z July 11).

Jerry will be operating around 14.056 and I will be at 14.062 +/- QRM.

The usual exchanges will be involved.

Fox sends: HoundCall RST SPC Name PWR HoundCall BK

Hound sends: de HoundCall RST SPC Name PWR BK

Fox acknowledges with: TU (or 72) and goes into QRZ FoxCall FOX K

Both Foxes will be running K2's. My K2/ATU connects through a 4:1 balun and ladder line to 400 feet of wire in a horizontal loop. I will be listening up 0.5 KHz and occasionally get down to my frequency.

72 and hope to hear lots of you Tuesday evening,

Tony
KB9YIG

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 21:15:45 -0500
From: "Jay Bromley" <w5jay@alltel.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102013] RE: P-TiCk last call
Message-ID: <012301c1081d\$10a04fe0\$6518150a@alltel.net>

Gang Hi,

The P-TiCKs are history and they all have new homes they are going to, grin!!! But you can still build one on your own, just check out the NorCal webpage at: <http://www.fix.net/norcal.html>

Thank all of your fellow P-TiCKers!!

Thanks again Gary Diana, Jerry Parker, Mike Gripe, and Doug Hendricks for helping with the P-TiCK project!!!

73 de jay..

p.s. I told Doug Hendricks that we would be lucky if we sold 100 kits. You QRP guys and gals are great!! Over 800 kits went out the door and all of the money was put back into the ArkieCon QRP forum. Thank you all again!!

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 22:24:23 -0400
From: "Don Wilhelm" <w3fpr@arrl.net>
To: <myetsko@insydesw.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102014] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
Message-ID: <032701c1081f\$a14ef800\$1d5ee641@dbw11main>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ok, I'll chime in on this discussion too.

At CVS, the counter clerk does not pretend to know all about drugs or tampons - they leave that for the pharmacist.

BUT, most of the counter clerks at Radio Shack try to give the impression that they know all there is to know about electronics when they really don't even know what they stock, or where it is. It is a situation similar to the weekend folks at ACE hardware who try to 'help' you as soon as you walk through the door when all they are accomplishing is to get in your way - and they advertize as 'The Helpful Hardware Man'.

When the clerks at Radio Shack start to behave like clerks rather than experts on everything electronic, then they will likely be considered similar to other clerks, but that day is not today's situation.

Granted, there are several Radio Shack locations where the manager and staff seem to know a lot of stuff, but that is not the norm, and they advertize themselves to be something that they are not. As long as that situation continues, they are fair game for criticism IMHO.

73,
Don W3FPR

----- Original Message -----

>...snip...
> Why don't they walk into CVS and act the same way in front of the
> counter clerk about drugs or tampons? Or show what great photo
> experts they are in front of the girl at the 1-hour photo machine?
> For some reason RS seems to bring that out in people.
>
> ...snip...

Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 19:37:51 -0700
From: Randy Foltz <rfoltz@turbonet.com>
To: Brian Murrey <bmurrey@amexol.net>
Cc: QRP-L <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102015] Re: Summer Homebrew Contest
Message-ID: <3B4918FF.3F5B9936@turbonet.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Brian Murrey wrote:

>
> If I use my TT2 for the transmitter, and my Norcal 40A for the
> receiver....do I get 5000 bonus points or do I get 2000 for the TT2 and 5000
> for the Norcal? <grin>
>
> 73

Well, Brian, that is an interesting question.

Since the rules say "using a HB transmitter" and "using a HB transceiver" and don't say that a transceiver overrules a receiver or a transmitter, I'll allow the 7000 points. That along with the x10 mult for less than 1 W should make for a nice score.

On the other hand, 40 m during the contest period, 2000 Z to

2400 Z, may not provide you with real high rates. :)

Have fun and let us know how the pair perform.

73,
Randy, K7TQ
QRP ARCI Contest Chairman

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 01:20:39 +0100
From: "TC Dufresne" <tdufresne@neb.rr.com>
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102016] What is a CC number??
Message-ID: <008f01c1080c\$fbbd4700\$0dba1c41@neb.rr.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<stupid question alert>
I am a Fists member and many times a Fists will send his number then add "my
CC number is..." What is a CC number?
</stupid question alert>
Tom
KC0GXX

Date: Sun, 08 Jul 2001 23:24:53 -0400
From: Pete Burbank <plburbank@kih.net>
To: w3fpr@arrl.net, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102017] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010708232010.00aa9d00@KIH.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

>SNIP
>themselves to be something that they are not. As long as that situation
>continues, they are fair game for criticism IMHO.
>
>73,
>Don W3FPR

Jeez Don,
If it is that much of a problem, DON'T GO THERE!

It's your choice.
Sick of this thread
Pete NV4V Kentucky

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 22:39:23 -0500
From: "Brian Murrey" <bmmurray@amexol.net>
To: <tdufresne@neb.rr.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102018] Re: What is a CC number??
Message-ID: <000901c10828\$c2097bc0\$86532bd1@iquest.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

CC is for those that have earned the Century Club award. You get to be a CC member once you have worked 100 fists. So keep track of them. Then there are awards for working certain numbers of CC members...etc etc.

It's a fun way to chase paper.

73

----- Original Message -----
From: "TC Dufresne" <tdufresne@neb.rr.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2001 7:20 PM
Subject: What is a CC number??

> <stupid question alert>
> I am a Fists member and many times a Fists will send his number then add
"my
> CC number is..." What is a CC number?
> </stupid question alert>
> Tom
> KCOGXX
>
>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 00:05:51 EDT

From: W2SH@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Cc: sunbyrd@gte.net
Subject: [102019] RE: 10 Meter QRP Ideas Needed
Message-ID: <a1.17de6195.287a879f@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Working over a used CB rig would seem to be an economical and fairly simple solution to the dearth of 10-meter rigs in kit form.

Charles, W2SH

Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 22:51:47 -0600
From: "Jerry McCollom" <w0mc@club-pre.org>
To: <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102020] Cub Fox Pelt-O-Rama! W0MC Cub Fox Announcement
Message-ID: <00ae01c10833\$2c57f240\$baac11d8@dsl.frii.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Folks,

As Tony KB9YIG mentioned, you'll have an opportunity to catch two pelts on Tuesday. I'll be taking the "low road" around 14.056 +/- QRM. I'm crossing my fingers that our regular afternoon thunderstorms are held at bay so I can have a great go!

My original plan was to use my trusty K2 #176 for the hunt, but since I put the finishing touches on K1 #779 this afternoon, I may opt to hand out pelts with it... decisions, decisions! I'll be operating from my home QTH here in Fort Collins, CO. My antenna is a stealthy-but-functional "under-the-eaves" doublet oriented roughly NW/SE. Since I'll be talking about stealthy antennas at SuperFest 2001, I hope to have another fantastic testimony to offer folks!

Here's looking forward to a great hunt -- see you Tuesday evening at 0200Z!

72,

Jerry
W0MC

SuperFest 2001 ** 14 July 2001 ** <http://www.qsl.net/n0rc/hamfest/>

Date: Sat, 7 Jul 2001 21:26:33 -0700
From: "Dave Fifield" <ad6a@earthlink.net>
To: <jdilorenzo3301@altavista.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102021] Re: Redhot NC20 TX offset problem
Message-ID: <000501c10834\$ec1c8c20\$0600a8c0@pacbell.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

John,

Don't have any email in my inbox asking for help on this? Did you send me any?

Anyway, I think the answer is simple. When you do the TX offset setting, you will find there are two settings of the trimcap that will give you tone (actually, you may be able to hear tone at four settings of the trimcap!! this is due to the trimcap being symmetrical). One of the tones is MUCH louder than the other - this is the one you want. My guess is that you are setting the TX offset to the wrong sideband, that's why you have to keep your RIT all the way offset.

Let me know if you still have trouble setting it after trying this.
Cheers,
Dave Fifield, AD6A

----- Original Message -----
From: "John DiLorenzo" <jdilorenzo3301@altavista.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Saturday, July 07, 2001 8:53 PM
Subject: Redhot NC20 TX offset problem

I have a problem with my Redhot NC20 transmit offset. On my first 3 QSOs with the radio, I've had to set the RIT all the way down (just over 1 kHz) to hear an answer to my calling CQ. Either I have a problem, or everyone is running split on 14.062.

The radio does not normally let you hear the "real" side tone. Instead, a

synthesized side tone is
output from the TiCK keyer chip. In order to set the TX offset, three temporary
mods have to be
made. First, the audio derived AGC is disabled; second, a signal from the keyer
that normally
causes the AGC to go to full limit is disabled; and third, a resistor is added
around a FET switch
that kills the received audio when transmitting. Making these changes, (I've done
this three
times), the transmit BFO is adjusted so that I hear a 600 Hz tone, very near the
synthesized tone in
fact. I then return the radio to normal by undoing all the mods, and find that I
am transmitting 1
kHz below where I should be. I've checked the RIT circuitry and verified that the
contribution from
the RIT is disabled during transmit. How can this be if I hear the correct side
tone with the
temporary mods? I know I could fix this with a good frequency counter, but I just
can't seem to
find one i!
n my junk box. Any suggestions?

Thanks in advance,
73, John DiLorenzo
KC8PXF

Find the best deals on the web at AltaVista Shopping!
<http://www.shopping.altavista.com>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 05:52:37 -0400
From: "Ron Polityka" <wb3aal@fast.net>
To: "Appalachian Trail Award" <ATRAIL-L@Lehigh.EDU>, ". QRP-L" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>,
". NJ QRP-L" <njqrp@njqrp.org>,
". Eastern PA QRP Club" <epaqrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102022] Appalachian Trail in PA Today
Message-ID: <006301c1085c\$e3dcdb00\$810f5cd1@wb3aal>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello,

I am packed and the wx looks good for a hike on the AT

in PA. I am heading out north on the AT from Route 501.

I plan to stop at a camping spot, if there are campers there
I will proceed to Round Head.

I could be on the air as soon as 12:00 UTC. So if you work me
please post me on the list servers. I am going to try to
work the higher hf bands if they are open. I plan to first start
out on 80 meters to try the new 166' doublet.

Wx today is going to be Hot and Humid. I plan to be out of there
by 16:00 UTC.

72 & 73
Good DXing

Ron Polityka
de WB3AAL
wb3aal@fast.net

vvv Eastern Pennsylvania QRP Web Page vvv
<http://www.n3epa.org>
Eastern Pennsylvania QRP Club Call
N3EPA E-mail address: n3epa@fast.net

EPA QRP #1	ARRL Life Member
KL7 QRP # 309	G-QRP # 3031
ARCI QRP # 5318	10 - X #13173
NorCal	BB #35 N3EPA
ARS # 380	HI QRP #153
VA QRP Society #45	MI QRP #1703
K2 sn1392	NJ QRP #179

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 06:38:54 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: <w3fpr@arrl.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102023] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
Message-ID: <002401c10863\$62aa5880\$0600a8c0@dad>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

So who's the problem here? The village idiot? Or
the person who has to always show he's 'better' than

the village idiot by putting him down?

Mike

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 06:10:37 MDT
From: Mark Brueggemann <markb@abq.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102024] Re: Solar Panel and Battery question
Message-ID: <B0000224622@atlanta.abq.com>

** Reply to note from k5di@zianet.com

>
>
> Dan, and the group, I can't figure out why a voltage standard and
> a series pass transistor would not be the best regulator you can use.

It is certainly the most simple, but not the most efficient, due to the voltage drop of linear regulators. Depending on the input/output voltage you can waste a pretty significant amount of energy in the pass transistor. A more efficient approach is to use one of the "universal" switch mode, multi-chemistry battery charge IC's. They usually use a FET to apply PWM to the battery, which is more efficient than linear regulation. Using an internal precision shunt and voltage sensing, these chips detect the particular charge characteristics of the different battery chemistries and regulate the charge accordingly. Maxim, Unitrode, Linear Tech and probably half a dozen others make charge control chips like these. Most interface to the batteries directly, or by using external larger switches, can handle larger (Ah) configurations. Efficiencies are well into the 90 percent range.

===>Mark

Mark Brueggemann KA9LXP
Albuquerque, NM markb@abq.com
See my S-10 EV at my Ham Radio Page
<http://www.qsl.net/ka9lxp>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 06:22:37 -0600 (MDT)
From: "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>

To: Dan Tayloe <dtayloe@home.com>
Cc: "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102025] Re: [101863] Solar Panel and Battery question
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0107090554420.1362-100000@localhost.localdomain>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Sun, 8 Jul 2001, Dan Tayloe wrote:

> I am not a chemist, but from the reading on the web sites on the care
> and treatment of the different battery chemistries, they all need to be
> treated differently.

That is expected because they use different chemical reactions to
charge/discharge.

>
> The "gel cell" and the lead acid battery like to be float charged using
> a constant voltage source. I was recently reading that float charging is
> recommended in "non cyclic" applications where the battery is not
> discharged more than once every two months (!). A different charging
> mechanism is required for fast charging.
>

This is the case of my deep cycle RV battery being charged with a
solar cell and controller. Each day the charge comes up with the sun until
the voltage reaches about 14.2 volts, and then it stops.

> Many of the newer batteries such as Li-ion are difficult to fast charge.
> >From my readings on charger ICs for Li-ion, they are fast charged in
> high current pulses, not with a steady DC current. See section 4.3.3.2
> A constant current source **cannot** be used to charge a Li-ion battery.
>
> See <http://www.national.com/ds/LM/LM3647.pdf> for the description of
> a chip that will charge Nicad, NiMH, and Li-ion batteries. In this
> description are the charging voltage characteristics of the three
> different battery types.
>

This web page PDF is a gold mine of information. I need to print
it and then study what they say. I have a VHS camera that uses NiCad 6
volt batteries and the charger is a nice box that must have an LM3647 in
it. It has the discharge cycle, then charge at 3 rates, and it measures
temperature.

> >From what I can read between the line, these newer battery types are

> difficult to fast charge because it can be difficult to tell when they
> are done charging. It is not good to continue pumping high current into
> them after they are finished charging!

>

> The National part shows how to configure a common LM317 as a current
> source. See section 4.4.2. You need only U3, R4 and R37 to feed the
> battery. The diode and other stuff is not needed. R4 sets the current.
> $I \text{ (amps)} = 1.25\text{v}/R4$, so as shown, the charging current is 250 ma, $R4 =$
> 22 ohms produces 60 ma.

>

This is the simplest way to charge a NiCad or NiMH battery. The
Motorola fast charge (1 hour) charger measures temperature and charges
with high current until the temperature reaches a maximum value.

>

> I was glad to see that trickle charging up to a rate of C/20 was
> acceptable for NiMH batteries. My homebrew portable 40m rig draws about
> 11 ma at 12v on receive, so with a charging limit of C/20 (60 ma for an
> inexpensive 1200 mah AA NiMH battery pack), that leaves 60 ma to charge
> the batteries when I am not using the rig, or 49 ma to charge the
> batteries when receiving to take some of the sting out of transmitting.
> A small battery pack can easily be used to last an entire (daylight!)
> contest under these conditions.

>

Charger units might be a good kit for the QRP group. The first
step is to decide what chemistry to design for, and then design the unit
to provide either a low current holding charge or a high current shaped
fast charge. I think there MUST be a temperature "probe" that you tape to
the battery under charge. Make it so the power source can be from a wall
wart or a solar panel. The goal is to get the longest possible life from
the battery.

My experience is that NiMH battery packs can be made from
individual cells, or bought as a package from Mouser for good low prices.
I build laptop batteries with these cells. They are dirt cheap compared to
a new IBM or NEC battery.

--

Yours Truly,

- Karl F. Larsen, k5di@arrl.net (505) 524-3303 -

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 05:25:41 -0700
From: "Mike Morrell" <morrellm@ameritech.net>

To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Message-ID: <090701190.19530@webbox.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 09:02:31 EDT
From: RLemmel@aol.com
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102027] Re: Appalachian Trail in PA Today
Message-ID: <94.16834ffe.287b0567@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Good morning- Ron wb3aal is now alive and well around 7042 es calling cq.
Worked him at 1254 utc es he was 449 nr cincy but sig picked up 559 at end .
Solid cpy from the AT.

72 es give him call- Randy,wv9n es off to work.

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 09:18:37 -0400
From: "Lofstead, Jerry" <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102028] RE: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <078F21595FA7D411B87B00805FA728E64A48D1@atlexc02ntms.hboc.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I spent last week on vacation and reading the original, I have the new edition on order. Using common sense and the associated math, I could not see how someone would or could challenge the information! The last time I checked, $1+1=2$ which is what the book breaks down in relatively easy math. The vector diagrams were great to help understand what was happening. I am sure glad I wasn't crazy all these years with the same opinions... 8-)

It is superb reading and gives all, a true understanding about antenna feed lines. If it's good enough for satellite antennas, it's good enough for the back yard antenna!

Jerry
W3CDE

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 08:27:16 -0500
From: "Patrick Cummins" <pcummins@misnet.com>
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102029] RE: toroid cores , thanks and status
Message-ID: <000001c1087c\$9cd5aaa0\$6a8489d0@pavilion>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi y'all

A note of thanks for all who responded to my question - too many to thank individually. Got quite a few ideas to try out. Have ordered a bunch of cores to experiment with (All Electronics had some for 10 for a buck). When I get the cores will experiment with the different ways I got from you. With luck I will be able to give you an update and information on which I find to be the best way to cleave the cores. Hope to have the data in about 1 or 2 months. Again thanks!

Patrick S. Cummins W5PSC
pcummins@misnet.com

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 08:37:41 -0500
From: "Patrick Cummins" <pcummins@misnet.com>
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102030] Need antenna guru help
Message-ID: <000101c1087c\$9d8e4c40\$6a8489d0@pavilion>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi there:

I need some help from you antenna gurus on what books I need to get. I

need something on antenna design/theory that does not assume an intimate or profound knowledge of ODE's or PDE's. (If such a thing exists.) I have all (at least most) of the ARRL, CQ PUBLICATIONS and RSGB books. I also have a copy of termin (which is where I intend to begin). However should I be looking in Kraus or Henny or Jasic or someone else's book. I especially need a book that has some information also on antenna measurements (got Carr and also Termini and Pettit). If ODE's and PDE's are going to be a requirement anyone know of a good basic or beginners book on PDE's? I don't care if they are out of print since I usually can get a copy from somewhere. (I know a good used book dealer.) One requirement - all the books must be in English - since I don't know any foreign languages.
TNX

Patrick S. Cummins W5PSC
pcummins@misnet.com

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 09:51:42 -0400
From: "Mike Yettsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102031] New CW testing
Message-ID: <00e801c1087e\$4c2e78a0\$6b01a8c0@INSYDENT>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Any comments now that the new CW testing protocol is in place? I would have thought that would generate a lot of comments.

Personally, I prefer Farnsworth, but I'm not sure running at 15wpm for a 5wpm test is good, that may be a bit too fast.

Back when I learned the code, I felt that Farnsworth (as opposed to a straight speed) actually was a bit easier, as the extended 'quiet time' gave me the ability to do a 'mental lookup' that is possible at 5wpm. I'd recognize the character and have that slight pause to figure it out.

Mike

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 10:23:19 EDT
From: PDouglas12@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102032] Small Wonders Labs PSK-30 coming soon to a theatre near you
Message-ID: <20.18f24431.287b1857@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi guys,

I am lucky to number Dave Benson of NN1G fame as one of my friends. Recently I asked him about his progress on his PSK-30 project, and he surprised me by sending me the first one off the line (other than the "artist's proof") to build and report back to him. I have proofed a number of manuals for him and other friends, and it gives me a chance to feel like I'm part of the creative process, even if that's mostly illusion. In a way, I suppose, I am the idiot who gets to confirm that the instructions are idiot proof!

Anyway, I did find some insignificant errors, but the work is, as usual, first rate; you folks are in for a treat again.

Oh, you want to know if it works? Yeah, it works great. As soon as I tuned it up, I was seeing signals--considering daytime propagation. Incidentally, tune up was plug easy using a wattmeter. I didn't actually make a contact until after 9 PM local (full dark), but my signal report was good at that time, and the guy was so impressed he said he was going to watch Dave's website (www.smallwonderlabs.com) for announcement of availability. Shouldn't be long before you can buy one of these honeys.

The rig itself is a full superhet with four poles if crystal IF filtering, covering about 3-4 kHz from about 10138.5 to 10142 or so. It does about 2.5 watts on my wattmeter. It is not a Warbler, which is a nice little rig (I have one); it is a full-blown 30 meter version of the SWL PSK-20.

Dave is a friend, but I pay for my stuff--retail. So my comments are my own, and I am just a customer like anybody else. I admit, though, that I am a bit smug about being the first on the block to have a PSK-30. :-) I figure I have Ser #1 off the factory run. So, I suppose you can start pestering Dave for a shipping date soon so you can have one too, and we can start seeing some activity on PSK31 on 30M.

That's my report, and I'm sticking to it.

72,

Preston WJ2V

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 10:47:01 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <tjarey@home.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102033] Re: Anyone remember
Message-ID: <1010609104700.KAA22684@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/6/01 11:02 PM, T.J. "SKIP" Arey N2EI at tjarey@home.com wrote:

>By the way, rememeber some of those companies who were at the top of the
>heap in the ealry days of home computing that fell by the wayside.
>
>Southwest Technical Products is one that comes to mind. They also made
>great audio kits.

So far as I know, SWTPc is still around (at least they were about 10
years ago) They just don't make computer stuff any more.

And GIMIX (remember them?) was still in business as of about 4 years ago.
They made a variety of AT bus and PCI adaptor cards.

But, you're right, there were gobs of computer companies that have
disappeared since those earliest days. (MITS, IMSAI amoung them)

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:09:15 +0000
From: Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [102034] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <01070915071000.01257@denneb.localdomain>
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hi Mike,

I definitely think it's a good move.
Having just recently begun to reach the point of being able to copy code at a
reasonable speed, I may not be the best source of an opinion. On the other
hand I do have fresh memory of what it was like to learn.

I believe the faster rate has a couple of great advantages.

1. It reduces the tendency to listen to dots and dashes and makes the ears hear more of the character as a sound or pattern.

2. As you practice and that pause between characters that you use for recognition becomes less and less, your already at higher speeds.

Unfortunately, when I decided to learn morse code I did not know to not look at a list of characters with their representative dots and dashes. It took me a long time to overcome this. For this reason when I practice, I like to use character speeds of between 18 and 20 WPM which helps me a great deal.

After listening to these speeds my mind is relaxed when hearing 12-13 WPM.

Well you asked and there is my .02 Benjamins worth...

72,

On Monday 09 July 2001 13:51 pm, you wrote:

> Any comments now that the new CW testing protocol is in place? I
> would have thought that would generate a lot of comments.

>

> Personally, I prefer Farnsworth, but I'm not sure running at 15wpm
> for a 5wpm test is good, that may be a bit too fast.

>

> Back when I learned the code, I felt that Farnsworth (as opposed to
> a straight speed) actually was a bit easier, as the extended 'quiet
> time' gave me the ability to do a 'mental lookup' that is possible at
> 5wpm. I'd recognize the character and have that slight pause to
> figure it out.

>

> Mike

--

Bill Walker - KD7JZB

<http://www.qsl.net/kd7jzb/>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 10:07:08 -0500

From: "Randall Jouett" <rules@bellsouth.net>

To: <k5zty@juno.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102035] Re: QRP-L???

Message-ID: <026f01c10889\$78327900\$6f084ed8@spock>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: Bill Stietenroth <k5zty@juno.com>

To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Friday, July 06, 2001 8:38 PM

Subject: QRP-L???

Hey Bill,

> I think it is about time to change the name of this reflector. It isn't
> much about QRP any more.. 132 messages, 100 of them were
> back biting, arguing, gossip and name calling. Not my kind of
> reflector.

Too dang true! The vast majority of the folks here are only interested in seeing if they can drive a nail into a discussion and make the poster of a message look stupid and inferior. Utter childishness, and that's the way I treat the vast majority of the posters on this reflector. If they don't want to place nice in the sandbox, then why should you or I act any differently? If they want to sling small amounts of sand, then let's REALLY go there and kick the stuff in their face, get ahold of their stupid person, and chunk their butts out of the sandbox and stomp them into the ground for good measure.

Oh, and it's worse than 132 messages! I just got back from vacation in Wyoming, and I had 800 messages that were nothing more than junk mail. I saved 3 -- count em! -- 3 messages that were worth a hoot and that were actually something that some of us might consider to be "signal."

Let it be known, though, that there is a QRP underground where a lot of us that know what in the heck is going on are talking. It's called private e-mail, and we've used QRP-L and the other reflectors to learn who these individuals are, Bill. We're having very relevant discussions using this format. Recently, we've been talking about DC receivers and their pitfalls, construction techniques, home-brewed, double-balanced mixer designs, broadband amplification, programming techniques, local-oscillator loading and construction of decent buffer amplifiers, VFO stability via shielding and the use of NPO and polystyrene caps, etc. It would be really nice if we could have these discussions on the reflector -- and then some! -- but we are tired of the

people here finding the slightest flaw in our discussions and logic, posting a flame, and then trying to make themselves look good at our expense.

We are also tired of the fact that the vast majority of the people here don't treat ham radio the way it should be, as in trying to emulate the designs and phillosophies of Maxwell, Armstrong, Tesla, Fermi, Neils Bohr, Einstein, Opinheimer, and the other greats of electronics and physics world. That is REALLY what amateur radio is all about. Well, that and learning via experimentation; learning by reading very technical books (constantly); testing and proving theorms; and conversing with our peers about our results. Will we ever attain the results of the people I just mentioned? Probably not, but we are at least willing to give it a shot and say the we tried :^). Who knows -- maybe we might get lucky? (Shrug.)

Any way, let it be known that there is an underground here on this and other reflectors, and that we are having really good signal-to-noise ratio discussions. We're just tired of posting comments of this type to the reflector and having folks call us stupid for asking relavent questions we might not have all the information about or having the same type of individual call us stupid (in so many words) because we're trying to do something constructive. Damn shame, if you ask me, and it's about time that these people realize that they are the people we are talking about when we mention the dumbing down, down-turn, and fall of ham radio.

I know exactly what you mean when you say, "Not my kind of reflector." Join us in e-mail, dude.

Randy

--

HAMateur Radio: AB5NI

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 08:28:47 -0700
From: "Bob Hightower" <nk7m@extremezone.com>
To: "qrp list" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>, "elecraft list" <elecraft@qth.net>
Subject: [102036] Fort Tuthill '01

Message-ID: <000d01c1088b\$d9f6efc0\$1f127d3f@dell>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just a gentle reminder that the annual Fort Tuthill QRP doin's is coming up.
Info follows:

Fort Tuthill 2001

July 27, 28, 29, 2001

Coconino County Fairgrounds, Fort Tuthill, AZ (5 Mi South of Flagstaff).

The Annual QRP Gathering at Fort Tuthill, Arizona, will feature building contests, door prizes, QRP activities, our famous Cookout (Saturday night), pancake breakfasts on Saturday and Sunday in the Group Campground, and, with any luck at all, some pickin' and jammin' by some of the most well-known musicians in the QRP community.

If you are a musician, even one 'of sorts', feel free to bring your guitar, banjo, mandolin, fiddle, bass or whatever and join in what is sure to become a continuing tradition. Singers are welcome, as well. A great time was had be all last year, and we hope to have a better one this year.

This is the largest hamfest in Arizona, and possibly the entire Southwest, and is held concurrent with the Arizona State Convention. If you have some stuff to sell, bring it along and we'll make some space for you.

The QRP doin's are free, as usual, but, starting this year, ARCA has found it necessary to charge admission to the hamfest area. The price is \$1.00 for the entire weekend, and you pay at the gate as you enter. Campground fees as of now are still \$7.00 per site per night. More on camping later.

As usual, there will be door prizes awarded. Drawing for door prizes will be based on the number at the bottom of your registration badge, so you MUST pre-register to be eligible for a prize, and must be present to win. To register, send an email to Bob Hightower nk7m@extremezone.com and Jerry Parker jparker@fix.net, including the names and calls (if any) of those attending, and your badges will be available on your arrival.

A partial list of donors of door prizes includes: Fred Lloyd of QRZ, Jay Bob Bromley and the Ft. Smith QRP group, Bill Kelsey of Kanga US, NorCal and Doug Hendricks, Verne Wright of portable antenna fame. Also, Fred at FAR Circuits, Gary Diana from Embedded Research, Chuck Olson, WB9KZY, of Jackson Harbor Press, Marshall Emm of Milestone Technologies/Oak Hills Research, Dave Benson of Small Wonder Labs and Bob Dyer of Wilderness Radio. There are more to come, and we'll update the list as they appear.

This year's theme will be construction, so, following that, the featured activity will be a Junk Box Wars U-Build-It event, with all parts provided...all you have to do is select the project you want to build (out of 10 possible), and you, or your team, gather up the parts from our junkbox, and build it. We'll provide the tools as well, but if you want to bring your own, feel free to do so. Prizes will be awarded for those judged to be the 'best built' and so on. Oh, yeah, they must work as well, so we'll be testing them out. This ought to be a good one, and a chance to involve even the youngest, as some of the projects are simple enough for them to build, with some Elmering.

And, as usual, we'll have our normal building contest....you build it, you bring it, we'll judge it. Anything you've built and are proud of! The categories for entries are; Ugly construction, Manhattan style construction, Dead Bug construction, Kits (either your design, or others) and Homebrew, or scratch built items. All entries must include documentation outlining the purpose/use of the item, and any test data which will show the properties of the item., and must be clearly labeled with the builder's name and call. If you cannot attend Tuthill, you may have someone enter your item by proxy.

Another special addition will be the Chuck Adams Manhattan Building contest. If you've built something, including the MH101 project currently going on, or any other Manhattan style project, bring it along. If you would like to enter, but can't make it to Tuthill, try to make arrangements with someone that is coming to bring it out for you, or, you can send it to us, with a return shipping box and enough postage to get it back to you, and we'll enter it for you. Please contact us by email to arrange for this (see the email link below).

The Group Campground is going to be the center of attention again, but we have to warn you..the shower building has been torn down. We've made arrangements with a motel close to the hamfest site for use as a shower facility. Details will be available at the camp area. There will be sanitary facilities available, though, so come on up into the cool pines and enjoy the weekend. As before, the cost is \$7.00 per site per night. There is plenty of room for RV's and tents, so join us.

The hamfest activities begin at dawn on Friday the 27th, with the main exhibit hall opening at 12:00 p.m. Friday. Campers can roll in anytime Thursday evening, as we have the campground reserved for that night through Sunday.

For questions or comments, please email <[A HREF="mailto:nk7m@extremezone.com"](mailto:nk7m@extremezone.com)> Bob Hightower NK7M. This information is also available at <http://www.extremezone.com/~nk7m/tut01.htm>.

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 10:31:00 -0500
From: Bcieslak@ra.rockwell.com
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102037] qsl Vendors
Message-ID: <0FCDDD2FDF.E96A8E9F-0N86256A84.00550887@ra.rockwell.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hey gang....

I got a new call coming and will need to get some new QSL's.....Its been a long time since I bought my last batch.
anyone have a recommendation?

Brian
soon to be ex-AE9K

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 11:28:50 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: "Rod Cerkoney, N0RC" <rod@n0rc.com>, "QRP" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102038] Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting
Message-ID: <1010609112852.LAA26784@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/6/01 10:33 PM, Rod Cerkoney, N0RC at rod@n0rc.com wrote:

>Now, I still would like to accommodate those with simple rigs. What
>did you think about the 10min every 30min idea?

I don't know what the best solution for that would be. After all, if you go simplex, then those with complex rigs are going to go simplex as well, and then you're right back where you started from -- no one can hear the fox for all the hounds calling him on his frequency.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 11:30:20 -0400
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
To: pcummins@misnet.com, qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102039] Re: Need antenna guru help
Message-ID: <3B49CE0C.2800D5CC@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Patrick,

It would help to know what type of antenna you are trying to design. To say what antenna book should I be reading is to say where should I start reading for my Ph.D..

Antennas are really fairly simple if you take the time to understand what you want and where they will be mounted. The same rules apply pretty much to all. Things like inter element spacing for multi-element arrays vary from design to design. mostly because of physical space limitations. Verticals are affected by ground. Wire is wire, dependent on only where the feed point is for impedance.

Be more specific. If you want a good general book, buy an ARRL Antenna Handbook and go from there!

73

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 11:43:59 EDT
From: Shepherd@aol.com
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102040] Re: The name is RADIO SHACK, gentlemen
Message-ID: <68.112892a4.287b2b40@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

QRP-1 Radio Shack thread v1.0
Commodore basic 2.0

10 Hit dead horse
20 Goto 10

72, oo
Dan, N8IE

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 11:50:06 EDT
From: Shepherd@aol.com
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102041] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <11a.15cbd51.287b2caf@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It does not really matter anymore how they give the code "test". Soon the goones at NCI will have their way and the code test will go away. So Farnsworth, straight, or any other method is a moot point.

"Long live 11 meters"

72, oo
Dan, N8IE

In a message dated Mon, 9 Jul 2001 9:52:53 AM Eastern Daylight Time, "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com> writes:

<< Any comments now that the new CW testing protocol is in place? I would have thought that would generate a lot of comments.

Personally, I prefer Farnsworth, but I'm not sure running at 15wpm for a 5wpm test is good, that may be a bit too fast.

Back when I learned the code, I felt that Farnsworth (as opposed to a straight speed) actually was a bit easier, as the extended 'quiet time' gave me the ability to do a 'mental lookup' that is possible at 5wpm. I'd recognize the character and have that slight pause to figure it out.

Mike

>>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 11:53:43 -0400
From: "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>

Subject: [102042] RE: New CW testing

Message-ID: <C3345B3FCEEEED2119FAA0008C739ABBD036F32AE@bosmsg2.gph.com>

Standardization certainly makes the test easier, though it probably doesn't simulate real life on the bands. I studied for the CW test at 18wpm Farnsworth, then on a hunch moved it down to 15. When I sat down to take the test, I was =horrified= to hear the 5wpm tape...at 5wpm. It was like listening to something entirely different...it was a big challenge to follow it. I would argue that the 5wpm test is actually the very worst possible compromise -- it ought to be faster (say, 12-15 wpm), or it ought to be eliminated altogether. But that opinion and \$.50...won't even get you a cup of coffee.

72

John Newell

KB1FPM

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 12:19:17 -0400
From: "ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102043] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <006001c10892\$e71d7780\$3294fea9@robertpa>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yes amateur radio is turning into a no skill required hobby. Not allot of satisfaction and accomplishment can be obtained in receiving a license just by basically guessing at some easy multiple choice questions. I just can't wait for all those whinners to go on the air and show the respect for others as they do on CB band. Yes not all CB'ers do this but the majority walk over eachother, cause havok and operate illegal gear with powermikes and amps that splatter all over the band.

Getting your amateur radio license is no longer challenging or rewarding and that's too bad! It's not surprizing to me why so many ham vetrans are leaving this hobby.

I still hear complaints by ham radio wannabees complaining about having to learn the new 5WPM code test. If you can't learn 5WPM code test check your pulse because your probably dead!

Learning the code was a right of passage into this hobby. Now it's a joke! Learning the code separated those who thought they wanted to get into this hobby and those who were passionate about becoming a ham.

Perhaps one of the few saving graces is QRP because most work CW and it is a challenge. I've seen gentlemen agreements on frequency useage diminish even moreso recently and it has also interfered in QRP operations.

Time will tell but it's hard to be optimistic.

73 and 88s
Good Buddy

----- Original Message -----

From: <Shephed@aol.com>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 11:50 AM

Subject: Re: New CW testing

> It does not really matter anymore how they give the code "test". Soon the
goones at NCI will have their way and the code test will go away. So
Farnsworth, straight, or any other method is a moot point.

>

> "Long live 11 meters"

>

> 72, oo

> Dan, N8IE

>

> In a message dated Mon, 9 Jul 2001 9:52:53 AM Eastern Daylight Time,
"Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com> writes:

>

> << Any comments now that the new CW testing protocol is in place? I

> would have thought that would generate a lot of comments.

>

> Personally, I prefer Farnsworth, but I'm not sure running at 15wpm

> for a 5wpm test is good, that may be a bit too fast.

>

> Back when I learned the code, I felt that Farnsworth (as opposed to

> a straight speed) actually was a bit easier, as the extended 'quiet

> time' gave me the ability to do a 'mental lookup' that is possible at

> 5wpm. I'd recognize the character and have that slight pause to

> figure it out.

>

> Mike

>

>

> >>

>

>

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 12:35:02 -0400

From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>

To: pcummins@misnet.com
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102044] Re: Need antenna guru help
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010709122723.009f04c0@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 08:37 AM 7/9/2001 -0500, Patrick Cummins wrote:

>Hi there:

> I need some help from you antenna gurus on what books I need to get. I
>need something on antenna design/theory that does not assume an intimate or
>profound knowledge of ODE's or PDE's. (If such a thing exists.) I have all
>(at least most) of the ARRL, CQ PUBLICATIONS and RSGB books.
>I also have a copy of termins (which is where I intend to begin). However
>should I be looking in Kraus or Henny or Jasic or someone elses book.

Sorry Patrick but once you get past all the usual ARRL/CQ/RSGB stuff, DE's are going to be necessary. That includes Kraus, Johnson & Jasik, Schelkunoff, Henny - I'm not sure. An interesting book on antenna design was written Walter Schultz (K3OQF) an number of years back - lots of math but not too much advanced stuff. A classic on antenna design was "Antenna Engineering" by A.E. LaPort (McGraw-Hill) from the late 40's. Lots of good material in the old NAB Manual (National Association of Broadcasters) if you can find one. This was a large trade manual/binder found only on the shelves of radio and TV stations. As I recall it had lots of stuff on antenna measurements.

Phil

> I
>especially need a book that has some information also on antenna
>measurements (got carr and also termine and pettit). If ODE's and PDE's are
>going to be a requierment anyone know of a good basic or beginners book on
>PDE's? I don't care if they are out of print since I usually can get a copy
>from somewhere. (I know a good used book dealer.) One requirement - all the
>books must be in english - since I don't know any foreign languages.

>TNX

>

>Patrick S. Cummins W5PSC
>pcummins@misnet.com

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 12:39:51 -0400
From: "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>

Subject: [102045] RE: New CW testing

Message-ID: <C3345B3FCEED2119FAA0008C739ABBD036F32AF@bosmsg2.gph.com>

Interesting observations...some thoughts...

> amateur radio is turning into a no skill required hobby

I think that's only partly true. Certainly, you can get on VHF/UHF without learning much, and indeed you may forget most of that pretty quickly.

However, just because the entry hurdles are lower doesn't mean that skills aren't required to operate successfully.

You could say much the same thing about radio-building these days, but I haven't heard anyone saying that Elecraft "makes it too easy" -- although from a certain point of view, they do! They do the R&D, they source the parts, and they provide such an extravagantly excellent manual that anyone who can read and pick up a soldering iron could probably successfully build a K2. (I do hear K2 ops belittling everyone who operates an "appliance" rig, but that's another question.) That's very different from designing something yourself, finding the right parts, and putting it on boards of your own design.

But the fact is, especially in the HF bands, that if regardless of whether you build a radio or buy it, operating well does require skill. In a way, the license is really just an opportunity to do what ham radio has always offered and required: experiment, and keep learning more by reading and operating. I don't think that the pessimism of the older-timers is really merited...the past almost always looks better. Heck, imagine what they were saying back before WW1 after the first federal communications act!!!

> Not allot of

> satisfaction and accomplishment can be obtained in receiving

> a license just

> by basically guessing at some easy multiple choice questions

True, but how would you separate those who just want to do the minimum from those who really want to learn and understand? I don't think tougher tests serve that goal. Heck, from the perspective of the average FRS or CB user, the amateur service looks way too hard as it is, even at the tech level.

> Learning the code separated those who thought they wanted to

> get into this

> hobby and those who were passionate about becoming a ham

I would argue that that's all that the 5wpm test does -- it's just an entry barrier. You can pass it and still not be able to actually use CW on the air. There's not too many people to talk to at 5wpm any more, so folks

are either going to move on rapidly or forget it.

72

John Newell

KB1FPM

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 12:48:37 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-
l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102046] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <002901c10897\$18aa9180\$6b01a8c0@INSYDENT>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: Newell, John O <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
> > Learning the code separated those who thought they wanted to
> > get into this
> > hobby and those who were passionate about becoming a ham
>
> I would argue that that's _all_ that the 5wpm test does -- it's just
an
> entry barrier. You can pass it and still not be able to actually use
CW on
> the air. There's not too many people to talk to at 5wpm any more, so
folks
> are either going to move on rapidly or forget it.

I would have to agree with you also. It was a 'barrier'. It's just one
more
mode. People had better realize that, because the cutting of CW
requirements isn't finished, I'm sure. And if they don't stop the
whining
about it, and start showing people that it's fun, it's going to go the
way
of AM, just a small hard core of supporters. But worst of all will be
it will
lose it's 'protected band plan' status.

I think the REAL problem is the people who treat their HAM license as
a grant, as a privilege, that's it's something they earned and now they
can get away with murder. Like the clowns who used to be on 14.313
and now seem to be on 80M.

The license should be thought of as an entrance exam. NOT a final
exam. You get in, then you REALLY start the learning process.

Mike

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 12:58:21 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102047] RE: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010709123956.009f5d40@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

There was very little controversy (if any) with the contents of the original book Jerry. The controversy started when ARRL included excerpts from the book in the big ARRL Handbook, and then that material was expanded to cover conjugate matches in amplifier output networks. This is where Warren Bruene (Collins amplifier/transmitter designer - famous, knowledgeable, experienced, legendary) stepped-in and said that conjugate matches in amplifiers was poppycock; the W2DU material doesn't apply to amplifiers, etc. A "war of words" was started between Bruene and Maxwell, with ARRL in the middle trying to decide who was right since they (ARRL) were the publishers of the book. On a technical level, nobody at ARRL was in any position to referee either of these guys; how can you referee two guys that know more about their own subjects than possibly anyone else on the planet ? It appears that Bruene won the argument (or was the most convincing or the most intimidating or had the highest stature or whatever). The ARRL, rather than just pull the controversial material on amplifier conjugate matches, pulled everything that Maxwell had written, from subsequent issues of the ARRL Handbook, and they stopped publishing his book. It appears that they had been convinced that most or all of Maxwell's work was faulty and they were unable to separate the wheat from the chaff. So they just trashed everything. The shame of it is that quite likely 98 or 99% of what Maxwell wrote was correct, but the controversial aspect of the remaining 1 or 2% overshadowed everything else. This sort of thing happens all the time in life.

Don't anyone even THINK about starting a thread on conjugate matches in amplifiers after reading this. It's extremely complicated and can not be solved here. The debate between Maxwell and Bruene is still ongoing to this day in QEX magazine as far as I know.

Phil

At 09:18 AM 7/9/2001 -0400, Lofstead, Jerry wrote:

>I spent last week on vacation and reading the original, I have the new
>edition on order. Using common sense and the associated math, I could not
>see how someone would or could challenge the information! The last time I
>checked, $1+1=2$ which is what the book breaks down in relatively easy math.
>The vector diagrams were great to help understand what was happening. I am
>sure glad I wasn't crazy all these years with the same opinions... 8-)
>
>It is superb reading and gives all, a true understanding about antenna feed
>lines. If it's good enough for satellite antennas, it's good enough for the
>back yard antenna!
>
>Jerry
>W3CDE

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 12:02:12 -0500 (CDT)
From: ac5ez@webtv.net (Larry)
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102048] cw test
Message-ID: <18185-3B49E394-1852@storefull-111.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
Content-Disposition: Inline
Content-Type: Text/Plain; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7Bit
MIME-Version: 1.0 (WebTV)

Years ago when my little group passed the novice exam we all learned the code the wrong way, Im sure, and later had to relearn it. Does learning 5wpm really serve any purpose? In the near future there will not be any discussion about learning 5 wpm because it will not be required. I am beginning to think that the proper way to learn code was to start at 20wpm . The emphasis seems to be on the "test" and not actually learning cw at a useable speed.

K1zw
Larry
Qcwa

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:14:34 -0400
From: "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
To: <phil@vaxxine.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102049] RE: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <GAECLOGOMILPLBGKKPEGCEOACJAA.crmabbott@mediaone.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Starting a thread on conjugate matches in amplifier output
networks
would not only be entertaining but more fun than Radio Shack and
the coming CW wars.....

73 oo

=====

Chuck Mabbott
AA8VS
42 19' 52" N 83 28' 32" W
Grid Square EN82gh
Home Page: <http://aa8vs.dhs.org/aa8vs>
FP-113 MI-QRP#1212 Firebirds #2117

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU]On
Behalf Of
Phil (VA3UX)
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 12:58 PM
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
Subject: RE: REFLECTIONS II

"..... very little controversy (if any) with the contents of the
original book Jerry. The controversy started when ARRL included
excerpts
from the book in the big ARRL Handbook, and then that material was
..."

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:09:45 -0400
From: "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <z1au@arrl.org>
To: "'qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU'" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102050] Re: Need antenna guru help
Message-ID: <125490A005E3D3118C9C00805FC743CC027E2E7A@KAHLESS>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

The Antenna Measurements chapter in the ARRL Antenna book was written by
Dick Turrin, who patented the dual mode feed, perhaps the finest dish feed

ever designed for efficiently feeding amateur microwave dishes.--Zack Lau
W1VT

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 10:18:18 -0700
From: Russ Dow <n7dw@pacbell.net>
To: Bcieslak@ra.rockwell.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102051] Re: qsl Vendors
Message-ID: <3B49E75A.2A1CB417@pacbell.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Brian,

Assuming you would like to have professionally printed QSLs, here are three printers to get you started. I believe they all offer samples upon request, so check 'em out for yourself.

<http://www.w4mpy.com/>
<http://www.rusprint.com/>
<http://www.qth.com/star/> (formerly WX9X)

I'm posting this to the list in case anybody else is interested.
Hope it helps.

FYI, I have used all three in the past and was very satisfied with their products. Personal opinion, no vested interest, etc...

73,
Russ N7DW

Bcieslak@ra.rockwell.com wrote:

>
> Hey gang....
>
> I got a new call coming and will need to get some new QSL's.....Its been a
> long time since I bought my last batch.
> anyone have a recommendation?
>
> Brian
> soon to be ex-AE9K

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:15:18 -0400
From: "Lofstead, Jerry" <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>
To: "'aa4lr@arrl.net'" <aa4lr@arrl.net>, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102052] RE: Antenna to Freespace Impedance Matching
Message-ID: <078F21595FA7D411B87B00805FA728E64A48DA@atlexc02ntms.h boc.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Looks to me that it is time for some reading of "Reflections II" and feed lines... Covers this question in detail. "The conjugate match"..

Jerry
W3CDE

snip>

>So back to the original question, in theory, it always seems better to
>match impedances for maximum power transfer. However, any antenna built
>with a 377 ohm impedance would be a non-tuned antenna, which would be
>lossy compared to a dipole, and a dipole is just barely adequate to
>detect the strongest known signals from space.

A 377 ohm antenna might be non-resonant, but it may have considerable GAIN compared to a dipole.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

SNIP>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:21:49 -0400
From: "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102053] RE: New CW testing
Message-ID: <C3345B3FCEEED2119FAA0008C739ABBD036F32B0@bosmsg2.gph.com>

> The license should be thought of as an entrance exam. NOT a final
> exam. You get in, then you REALLY start the learning process.

Amen, works for me. I would challenge the older-timers to give looking at licensing this way...see if they can resonate on this frequency. <g> I know

that in my field (securities law) there has been an explosion of "law" over the past 15 or so years. It is easy to forget the advantage I've had picking this stuff up one piece at a time over the years...but there's no way that someone new to it can grasp the whole ball of wax. I think it's the same with radios, in several ways, and sometimes it might be well to remember that very few of us sprang forth from the brow of Zeus, knowing everything about ham radio (or anything else!).

I think CW may stand a better chance than AM, just because it is so much more effective at QRP levels. There is a surge of interest in HF QRP generally and particularly in portable ops. This may turn out to be the last real refuge of CW. Heaven knows I wish I was better able to use CW...the 5wpm requirement by itself (which doesn't even include *sending* CW) really doesn't prove anything by itself.

72

John Newell

KB1FPM

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 13:30:54 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102054] RE: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010709133026.009f31f0@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 01:14 PM 7/9/2001 -0400, Charles Mabbott wrote:
>Starting a thread on conjugate matches in amplifier output
>networks
>would not only be entertaining but more fun than Radio Shack and
>the coming CW wars.....

NN00000000oooooooooooo.....

>73 oo
>=====

>Chuck Mabbott
>AA8VS
>42 19' 52" N 83 28' 32" W
>Grid Square EN82gh
>Home Page: <http://aa8vs.dhs.org/aa8vs>
>FP-113 MI-QRP#1212 Firebirds #2117
>
>
>-----Original Message-----

>From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU]On
>Behalf Of
>Phil (VA3UX)
>Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 12:58 PM
>To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
>Subject: RE: REFLECTIONS II
>
>
>"..... very little controversy (if any) with the contents of the
>original book Jerry. The controversy started when ARRL included
>excerpts
>from the book in the big ARRL Handbook, and then that material was
>..."

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 12:54:41 -0500
From: George Franklin <w0av@juno.com>
To: phil@vaxxine.com
Cc: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [102055] Re: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <20010709.125441.-1894343.0.w0av@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Gangue,

I hope no-one misunderstands and starts a thread on conjugal matches.

de George/W0AV

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:57:00 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: <ac5ez@webtv.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102056] Re: cw test
Message-ID: <002701c108a0\$910e2f20\$6b01a8c0@INSYDENT>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----
From: Larry <ac5ez@webtv.net>

> Years ago when my little group passed the novice exam we all learned the
> code the wrong way, Im sure, and later had to relearn it. Does learning
> 5wpm really serve any purpose? In the near future there will not be any
> discussion about learning 5 wpm because it will not be required. I am
> beginning to think that the proper way to learn code was to start at
> 20wpm . The emphasis seems to be on the "test" and not actually learning
> cw at a useable speed.
>
> K1zw
> Larry
> Qcwa

Well, you have to look at it two ways.

On one hand, if you KNOW someone is going long-term, and wants to establish a good long term goal, then yes, learn it at 20wpm or one of the methods that make it easier to get to the fast rates.

On the other hand, a LOT of people don't KNOW up front that they can have so much fun with CW. If you try to make them learn it the 'right' or 'better' way, the harder start routines will mean a higher dropout rate, or more frustration with CW. You then loose these people forever to CW. Maybe even to HAM radio. (Although now with codeless tech, that's not the danger it used to be. Now a newbie can get into HAM radio with vhf and take their time to get CW. This is a REAL benefit to the codeless tech entry path in my opinion.)

So, sweat it up front and risk loosing someone, or let them get in and sweat it later. Two different paths that you could argue back and forth all day.

Mike

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:51:48 -0400
From: "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>
To: "'phil@vaxxine.com'" <phil@vaxxine.com>, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102057] RE: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <125490A005E3D3118C9C00805FC743CC023B3486@KAHLESS>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Regarding conjugate matching and ARRL pubs, to answer a correspondence, I went to Dean Straw, N6BV, the ARRL Antenna Book editor. Here is his answer.

I will add that there is no animosity between ARRL and Mr Maxwell. To the contrary, we have reprinted his series on "Reflections" on the ARRL TIS web page and are now selling Reflections II.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
ARRL Lab
225 Main St
Newington, CT 06111
Tel: 860-594-0318
Internet: w1rfi@arrl.org
Web: <http://www.arrl.org/tis>

Ed Hare referred your message to me. Please allow me to introduce myself with a snapshot resume.

I was trained at Yale University (1967, BS Engineering and Applied Science) as an electronics engineer. I worked for 25 years in industry, both as a bench engineer and as a manager, in technical marketing and engineering. I have been the editor of "The ARRL Antenna Book" since 1993, when I first joined HQ staff.

Although I consulted long and hard with all technical staff at HQ before doing so, I am the person who ultimately is responsible for removing "conjugate matches" from the ARRL books with which I have been associated; mainly "The ARRL Antenna Book" and "The ARRL Handbook."

At the Dayton Hamvention this last month, I had my first opportunity to meet Walt Maxwell, W2DU, in-person. We discussed at some length the topic of conjugate matching. It was a useful and wide-ranging discussion, and I told Walt that we at ARRL took no "sides" on the personal controversy between him and Warren Bruene.

The fact that ARRL has published articles and letters by both men should testify that we are treating each of them fairly. You may have seen the on-going series of articles and counter-articles by both Walt and Warren published in QEX over the last year or so.

We are now, however, hearing from QEX readers that they are getting fed up with this never-ending controversy -- the same kind of messages we received from QST readers when that magazine became the forum some years ago for this conjugate-match battle. "Enough already!" is the message that is coming through, loud and clear.

At Dayton, when Walt asked me directly why I had removed the extensive section on the conjugate match that he had written in earlier ARRL Handbooks I told him the following:

- 1) I am a RF engineer. I have designed and worked with HF and VHF power amplifiers ranging from 250 mW excitors to 250 kW military SSB transmitters.
- 2) Never, not once, did I consciously use the concept of the "conjugate match" to design and develop any of the above-mentioned transmitters.
- 3) The output matching networks used in any transmitter I have worked on have been designed using straightforward network equations. The goal was to transform an output load resistance, usually 50 ohms, with a specified level of SWR, to the plate, collector or drain load-line resistance needed to develop the specified output power, at a specified level of Intermodulation Distortion (IMD) and at a specified level of harmonic content.
- 4) I know of no professional (or amateur) design engineer who has ever consciously used the concept of conjugate matching to design a transmitter -- and, believe me, I have asked many of them over the years this direct question because of the continuing Maxwell/Bruene battle.

Bill, for your information, you are not alone among hams when you say: "I'm not a Phd level mathematician and can't argue the merits of either position, heck I can't even understand what they are arguing about."

Readers of The ARRL Antenna Book and the ARRL Handbook have expressed much the same sentiment over the years. They have, in essence, marveled at the complexity of Walt's descriptions of the wave mechanics and the conjugate match, but at the same time many have not found the information to be of much practical value. I told Walt, face-to-face: Our readers have been forced to "take a drink from a firehose."

As an editor, I have a responsibility to our readers to present information that is not only technically accurate but which is also useful and practical to them. I told Walt that it is my opinion that there are better ways to describe matching networks to Radio Amateurs -- and that is the reason why I've removed the concept of conjugate matching.

It is not that the concept of the conjugate match itself is wrong -- it is

simply overwhelming and confusing to the average Radio Amateur. Others may disagree with this judgement, and I should hope that we can agree to disagree, as gentlemen of good will.

And I agree wholeheartedly with what Walt Maxwell himself wrote in the first edition of his book "Reflections," on page 19-7, in section 19.3:

"Until now the discussion has concentrated only on obtaining delivery of the maximum available power from a source which we have considered to be a classical generator. Returning for a moment to the definition of the conjugate match given in Beatty's item 1 (Section 19.1), we see that one of the conditions required for maximum absorption of power in the load is that the load resistance equals the source resistance of the generator. However, in this respect we must be aware of a crucial difference between the classical generator and the output circuit of a real-world RF power amplifier. This difference has no effect on our routine matching operations, but it does affect the terminology we use if we are to have a technically accurate description of the matching operations.

The difference is this: In the classical generator, the optimum load resistance required for delivering the maximum available power is always equal to the source resistance of the generator, as required for a conjugate match. However, because of the complex nature of various relationships between voltages and currents in an RF power amplifier, during normal operation the internal source resistance of the amplifier, R_S , is almost never equal to its optimum load resistance, R_L . Hence because of the different values of resistance existing between the source and the load when we complete a matching operation, we do not have a *true* conjugate match when an RF amplifier is coupled to an antenna tuner or a feed line. For the reader who has been conditioned to believe that the routine matching operation achieves a conjugate match, it may be helpful to understand that, in reality, the tuner or feed line is matched to the *optimum load resistance* of the amplifier, but it is conjugately *mismatched* to the source resistance."

[In the above direct quotation from "Reflections" I used asterisks (*) to indicate italics, since this e-mail message can't show italics.]

In a nutshell, the concept of true conjugate matching doesn't hold when it is extended to two real-world, practical situations: (1) an RF power amplifier and (2) a lossy transmission line. The concept of a conjugate match is useful when introducing the basic concepts of wave reflections (and Walt Maxwell does a wonderful job in his book on this subject). But when you come down to practical applications of RF power amplifiers and real-world, lossy transmission lines, it is better to analyze things by using precise mathematical models.

My own efforts in "The ARRL Antenna Book" and "The ARRL Handbook" has been to emphasize the hyperbolic transmission-line equation(s) to model real-world transmission lines, as embodied in my software programs TL (Transmission Line), TLA (Transmission Line, Advanced) and TLW (Transmission Line for Windows).

At Dayton, I also re-affirmed to Walt that the reason why ARRL decided not to reprint "Reflections" was a simple economic one. The demand had fallen off greatly towards the end of the years we sold the book. Simply put, the people who wanted to buy the book had already done so and reprinting it was not a good economic move.

I hope this explanation is useful to you. I will try to answer specific question you raise below.

73, R. Dean Straw, N6BV
Senior Assistant Technical Editor, ARRL
Editor, "The ARRL Antenna Book"
Editor, transmission line chapter, "The ARRL Handbook"

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 12:59:30 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: aa4lr@arrl.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102058] Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting
Message-ID: <3B49F102.C8EEED4D@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Rod, I still suggest that you announce and observe that the last 15 or 30 minutes of the Hunt will be devoted to calls on the Fox frequency only.

Prior to that NO calls on frequency (and preferably within 500 Hz) should be answered to discourage a pileup there. Keep things spread out - and only the Fox can do it.

I don't think that it is practical to try to split each 30-minute interval of the two-hour hunt into 10 minutes simplex and 20 minutes split. Who is going to time and coordinate all that? Sorry, but just don't think it would work . . .

As time goes on, I suspect that fewer and fewer Hounds are using rigs that do not have RIT, so maybe this is really a non-issue. The real issue is keeping the Fox frequency clear so that he can control the Hunt and we can all be on the same page.

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

Bill Coleman wrote:

>
> On 7/6/01 10:33 PM, Rod Cerkoney, N0RC at rod@n0rc.com wrote:
>
> >Now, I still would like to accommodate those with simple rigs. What
> >did you think about the 10min every 30min idea?
>
> I don't know what the best solution for that would be. After all, if you
> go simplex, then those with complex rigs are going to go simplex as well,
> and then you're right back where you started from -- no one can hear the
> fox for all the hounds calling him on his frequency.

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:59:17 -0400
From: "Brian" <bmmurray@amexol.net>
To: <w0av@juno.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102059] Re: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <006d01c108a0\$df9c0c20\$3d05080a@cincom.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Or conjugal visits...although, during my stay with the local constabulary, I found those to be quite refreshing.

----- Original Message -----

From: "George Franklin" <w0av@juno.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 1:54 PM
Subject: Re: REFLECTIONS II

> Gangue,
>
> I hope no-one misunderstands and starts a thread on conjugal matches.
>
> de George/W0AV

>

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 14:08:53 -0400
From: Kenneth Hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102060] QRP-L?
Message-ID: <3B49F335.F9B61E67@wfu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Don't give up the ship!

Last Spring I was out of country for 7 weeks. I had thought my email was suspended--but no, there were 3,000+ messages waiting for me. Maybe 75% were from the qrp-l, the rest a miscellany of professional and institutional things.

It took me weeks to get thru it all: flame wars, odd questions, rehashing old issues, and endless "look it up in the book" responses. Kept none of them. And that was the professional and institutional lists.

QRP-L, on the other hand, had the usual "I worked XXXXX on 14.058 at 0111 UTC", Great stuff for sale with a message posted 10 seconds later "All Sold," etc. And tons of useful websites, detailed technical info, basic operating suggestions, etc. I have a pile of over a hundred that I printed out for reference.

Yes, there are some who seem to think they need to put others down. You'll meet them in life anywhere, anytime. Why should ham radio be different? You wouldn't believe the criticism I got when I posted last January that I found the 2000 Handbook on sale at a well-known chain. And you wouldn't believe the grateful messages I also received from folks who never would have known if they hadn't seen it on the list. Even got a couple phone calls!

Yup, continue to have great discussions with a small group on dc receiver design, VFO stability, etc. A list this large is cumbersome for technical discussions, but know that there are lurkers and occasional posters who really know a lot, and leaving them out of the conversation impoverishes any consideration. I am grateful to many on this list for extremely useful information, both theoretical and hands-on. I get postings from maybe a dozen lists, but I make sure to read the threads that are substantive on qrp-l. For the others, that's why I have a

delete key.

73

Ken KG4FGC

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:34:26 -0500
From: "Patrick Cummins" <pcummins@misnet.com>
To: <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102061] Need antenna guru help - more info concerning
Message-ID: <000001c108a5\$e5c985a0\$9d8489d0@pavilion>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi there

Well a couple of you have answered my original posting with some questions. Mainly that you need some more information about what I need to do. Sorry I was vague with the first posting.

What I am trying to do is improve my antenna system here at the qth. Since I am running qrp power levels I thought that this would probably be the best way to improve my signal. The qth I am at has some very stringent physical limitations that require that I use shortened antennas. I plan to experiment with dipoles to begin with since they are the simplest to construct (and hopefully understand).

Too get an idea of these restrictions, I do not have room enough to put up a horizontal 1/2 wave dipole except on perhaps 10 and 12 meters. Additionally I am also height restricted to about 12 feet with the antenna about 16 feet above the ground. I am presently using a pair of mobile whip antennas (verticals) arranged as a vertical dipole. I also don't have room enough to install a decent counterpoise or radials for a vertical antenna, the reason that I am using the vertical dipole. Also moving is not an option at the present time.

I intend to build me some measurement instruments so that I can get quantitative data on what I do. I believe that I can construct a field strength measurement system with which I can get at least 1db of measurement accuracy and repeatability. I will then do things to the antenna system and measure what the results are. What I want to be able to do is that after I have that data to be able to explain to myself why what I did gave me the results that I got. (Its kind of an exercise to get a better signal and at the same time understand what is happening.) I realize that this is still kind of vague but is the best that I can do at the present time.

As a matter of interest I am presently studying the latest ARRL Antenna book (which I just got) and also Moxons book HF Antennas for All Locations.

These may have the information I need but then again they may not. So I need a good book that covers design, evaluation, and the measurement of antenna systems, hopefully one that is not too mathematically complex. (Thus the reference to no differential equations if possible.) I may then at a later date look at using shortened phased array antennas in order to get me some directivity and perhaps noise immunity.

Thanks for the help.

Patrick S. Cummins W5PSC
pcummins@misnet.com

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:38:24 -0500
From: Harris Keith E CONT CNIN <harris_k@crane.navy.mil>
To: "'qrp-l@lehigh.edu'" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102062] Re: CW Test
Message-ID: <4F76B3D4A76AD111803B00A0C9893D9C06ED8DE1@cninexchsrv05>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

Just a few random thoughts on the subject. I think that referring to the CW test as a "barrier" perpetuates the view that CW is somehow so difficult to be almost impossible to master. I think that possibly referring to it as a "hurdle" rather than a "barrier" might put those facing it in a better mind set. It's amazing what a person can do if they think they can. It's also amazing what a person cannot accomplish if they think they can't. In Search and Rescue this is called "Positive Mental Attitude" or PMA. It has been shown to be a big difference in survival. In other things I suppose it could be called confidence, and with it you can do most anything you set your mind to.

On the question of all the "riff raff" that the new tests will let in, how many do you think will still be around when renewal time comes. I figure they'll get bored or frustrated at the level of knowledge required to just put a station together. Putting an HF station together is a bit more difficult than just plugging a radio and antenna together. Besides, how many answers will someone who acts like a "Say Bay'er" get from other hams? The novelty of calling CQ wears off pretty quickly when no one answers. There have always been lids and always will be. If the old testing created such talented and wonderful operators why did they come with the term "lid"? >From what I have read of the beginning of amateur radio the "real" operators, the telegraphers, didn't think very highly of amateurs.

On the bandwidth taken up by threads that some would deem inappropriate for qrp-l, do postings complaining about the bandwidth taken up take up any

bandwidth? I have seen many off topic posts on this reflector, some I have enjoyed, some not. I remember a lengthy thread on the subject of digital cameras recently, but no one got on the list complaining about it. Was it QRP related? Was the thread about famous hams following Chet Atkins death QRP related? Not really, but I thought it was very interesting. Was the thread discussing electronic emporiums of the past QRP related? Are the posts about such and such is going to be in this town or that, are there any good electronic stores there, or do you want to meet for coffee, QRP related? I'd say about as much as the Radio Shack thread was. I agree whole heartedly that some topics get beat to death, but this list would get kind of boring without some of these. I'd say that if scanning the emails to see what you want to read and deleting the rest takes too much time in your busy schedule, maybe you need to lighten your schedule a bit and take some time to smell the roses.

Back into my hole after donning the flame proofing.

73 de N9KH

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 14:35:56 -0400
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
To: JNewell@goodwinprocter.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102063] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <3B49F98C.113489D6@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well John,

When I got my NOVICE license it was good for exactly one year. I had to upgrade if I wanted to keep my call. Also, I could not get another novice license! I tried valiantly to get my code speed up but had to settle for a Technician class license so I could get another 6 month of practice. I finally passed the General in 1958, before the FCC in Washington.

I started out wanting to become a 40 meter phone type. Unfortunately my equipment choice, a DX-35, did not support that dream. I got better with CW because I had to. If there is any problem today, it is that the beginner does not have to face any deadline. His license is good for 5 years, just like mine! What incentive has incentive licensing provided?

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 10:49:18 -0700
From: lhlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
To: QRP-L list <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102064] QRP Wall Wart
Message-ID: <032501c1089f\$7a845640\$650dfea9@nvhbell.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I recently got a 12V 1.25A regulated wall wart from Jameco. (catalog p.n.161533, \$13.95). It is small (~2.9 x 1.6 x 1.6"), very light (~6.5 oz) and has a 6' cord with 2.1 x 5.5 mm coaxial connector. Its light weight indicates that it is a swticher. They list a number of similar small light-weight regulated wall warts with various voltages and current capacities.

On a scope it showed 20mv spikes at about 55kHz under no load and 30mv ripple at about 120kHz under a 1/2 amp load. I've been using it with my K1 and have not detected any hash on 40 or 20m using my home dipoles. It remains to be seen how well it works when using portable antennas and other QRP rigs that may not be as immune to supply hash.

W7DZN

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 14:55:40 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102065] RE: Antenna to Freespace Impedance Matching
Message-ID: <1010609145539.0AA14775@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/9/01 1:15 PM, Lofstead, Jerry at Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com wrote:

>Looks to me that it is time for some reading of "Reflections II" and feed
>lines... Covers this question in detail. "The conjugate match"..

A conjugate match matches the entire antenna system - feedline and all.

(But, no, a conjugate match does not result in feedline radiation)

My whole point was to show that there's nothing magic about impedances of 50 or 70 ohms. Resonant antennas can have a variety of impedances, as can non-resonant antennas.

Maxwell would agree that antenna resonance and/or impedance have little to do with antenna performance.

The best example is the dummy load. It's perfectly resonant on all frequencies, and has a perfect impedance of 50 ohms. It's also 100% lossy.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:01:18 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <ac5ez@webtv.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102066] Re: cw test
Message-ID: <1010609150119.PAA15685@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/9/01 1:02 PM, Larry at ac5ez@webtv.net wrote:

>Years ago when my little group passed the novice exam we all learned the
>code the wrong way, Im sure, and later had to relearn it. Does learning
>5wpm really serve any purpose?

It can help you to pass a test....

>In the near future there will not be any
>discussion about learning 5 wpm because it will not be required.

a) that future hasn't yet arrived.
b) 5 wpm code requires so little effort to learn that I can't see how it might be a barrier. 13 wpm certainly was, for some people.

> I am
>beginning to think that the proper way to learn code was to start at
>20wpm . The emphasis seems to be on the "test" and not actually learning
>cw at a useable speed.

I agree 100%. If you were learning code in order to be able to operate effectively, you would start off with a speed of 25-30 wpm, possibly spaced out between characters or words. By the time you have mastered all the character (or word) sounds, you've already got a leg up on higher speed operation.

When code is sent slow, it becomes possible to count the elements, which limits the speed one can achieve later, until this has been re-learned.

By starting off with fast code, one learns the sounds as a whole, rather than listening for, and dissecting the elements.

Wayne Green used to say that people ought to learn code at 50 wpm, but this may be a bit excessive.

The armed forces used to start students off at 25-35 wpm. It made them effective operators in a short time.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:11:25 -0400
From: "Richard Brummer, K2JQ" <k2jq@bestweb.net>
To: <w6toy@erols.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102067] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <00d101c108aa\$f4711a00\$5b04b3d8@obvious>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>When I got my NOVICE license it was good for exactly
>one year.

The two-year Novice license was probably a better compromise. One year can go by awfully quickly !

>If there is any problem today, it is that the beginner
>does not have to face any deadline.

Very true.

This is almost a moot point, and will probably become one in short order -- if CW was a requirement for a job that you were applying for, you'd learn it next week, if you had to !

>His license is good for 5 years, just like mine!

Worse -- TEN (10) years, just like yours !

Dick K2JQ

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:08:54 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <harris_k@crane.navy.mil>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102068] Re: CW Test
Message-ID: <1010609150855.PAA16571@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/9/01 2:38 PM, Harris Keith E CONT CNIN at harris_k@crane.navy.mil wrote:

>Just a few random thoughts on the subject. I think that referring to the CW
>test as a "barrier" perpetuates the view that CW is somehow so difficult to
>be almost impossible to master. I think that possibly referring to it as a
>"hurdle" rather than a "barrier" might put those facing it in a better mind
>set.

There's actually some precedent for this. In early amateur licensing (back when code was tremendously relevant to day-to-day amateur operation), the required code speeds were 10 and 20 wpm. At some point, the FCC (or it may have been prior to the FCC) changed this to 13 wpm.

Why was 13 wpm important? Well, at 10 wpm, most people can use a rather long cognitive process to decode morse. They form a mental look-up table. They hear the dits and dahs, translate them to dots and dashes, and look them up on a mental diagram of dots and dashes -- like you would find with a walke-talke or a scout telegraphers set.

You can certainly do this at 5 wpm, but 10 wpm is about the limit. At 13 wpm, you have to be able to just hear the sound, and write down the character. The FCC knew this. That's why it set the bar at 13 wpm, rather

than the more rational 10 wpm. (A 5-10-20 wpm progression would certainly been more logical)

So, for some, 13 wpm was a formidable barrier, since they faced relearning the code.

The funny thing is, that code is not, and has never been hard to learn. All it requires is practice.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:15:26 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <trandall@idsi.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102069] Re: Mode 516 Suggestions
Message-ID: <1010609151526.PAA17281@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/7/01 5:09 PM, trandall@idsi.net at trandall@idsi.net wrote:

>Funny you should mention that Bill. I've been considering getting a Mac
>the past few months myself. I'm now waiting until the Mac World N.Y. expo on
>July 18th to see what the new imacs are like. My MAIN concern is still being
>able to do digital ham radio like packet and PSK-31.

There are applications to do this without using a serial port. Perhaps
the most popular is Black Cat Systems MultiMode
<<http://www.blackcatsystems.com/>>

> I know that serial to
>USB adapters are available, but is it as simple as hooking up the adapter
>and it works?

Pretty much. The MacOS still has serial support internally, since it is
used for built-in modems.

>No need to change wire connections?

If you hooked it to a Mac before, you shouldn't need new connectors.

>I'd use Virtual PC at
>times so that I could still use the programs that I love with the Mac. I

>still use a few DOS programs, astronomy and sat tracking as well as KaGold
>for packet.

I've not had much luck using hardware-dependant programs on PC emulators.
But then, I don't have the latest programs, such as Virtual PC, either.

> So how many others are out there on the list that use Macs? I'd like to
>hear some opinions if possible.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:25:35 -0400
From: "Newell, John O" <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>
To: unlisted-recipients;; (no To-header on input)
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102070] RE: New CW testing
Message-ID: <C3345B3FCEEED2119FAA0008C739ABBD036F32B3@bosmsg2.gph.com>

Bruce, good thoughts. I don't know the answers. (I am hesitating to keep
throwing replies out here because it's not very topical, but at least it's
all polite!)

Incentives. When my older boy and I got our tickets last year, he said in
the car on the way home "Now I'm going to start studying for my general!" I
said, "What, are you crazy? I'm done with tests!" But I started really
poking around in ways that I couldn't _until we were licensed_ (or at that's
how it seemed to me), and decided "this VHF/UHF stuff is pretty limited,
considering what I'd like to do...better get that general." So I
did...unfortunately, school and music and sports and scouts have conspired
to keep my son from finding enough time to learn CW. I am now working on
the extra exam, which will actually be quite a feat for me because I am the
result of some very bad experiments in public school mathematics education
in the 60s and 70s -- but I will do it. It isn't going as fast as I'd like,
either, because I spend a lot more time reading and fiddling with real
antennas and other practical operating issues that don't directly help me
pass the exam, though they do expand my operating abilities (which is the
real thing). The bottom line is that I got the general because I wanted HF,
and I will get the extra because I want to show that I've learned more and I
want the extra spectrum allocated for extras. So, those have been my
incentives, and I think that there are plenty of operators who see things
the same.

The rest? They either hang out on 2m, or maybe they don't renew...I don't think that the current licensing regime was TEOTWAWKI, though it certainly is different than it was when I was the age of my older boy.

BTW, can someone tell me where the term "lid" comes from? I know what it means (I think), but have no idea why lids are called "lids."

73

John Newell

KB1FPM

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the

attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 16:27:10 -0400
From: "Ron Polityka" <wb3aal@fast.net>
To: ". QRP-L" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>, ". NJ QRP-L" <njqrp@njqrp.org>, ". Eastern PA QRP Club" <epaqrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>,
"Appalachian Trail Award" <ATRAIL-L@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102071] Monday's AT Trip
Message-ID: <00f801c108b5\$890fc760\$6e155cd1@wb3aal>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello,

If you are not interested in my Appalachian Trail Trip,
Please Delete Now.

What a great day out on the AT. I started my trip around 10:30 UTC in the morning. I arrived at the Rte. 501 parking lot around 11:15 UTC. I packed up and started hiking to the camping area about 1 mile off the road. No one was there so I decided to setup in this location.

I tried to hang a 166' doublet. Wow, what a mistake. There is no conceivable way you can hang a 166' antenna on the AT if you are not in the clear. I really did not want to take any trees down either. Hi Hi ;-)

So I strung my 66' doublet up and tried the K2's ATU. I could get all bands to load except 20 and 10 meters. So I called CQ on 40 meters for a while. With no luck I restrung the ends higher away from the wet ground. Now I can get all bands except 10 meters to load, no problem since 10 was dead.

I made 12 QSO's over the next 4 hours. I heard some DL's on 15 CQing but I could not raise anyone. I talked to the following stations:

WV9N Randy in OH on 40 Meters
W8YMO Harry in OH on 40 Meters

KA0YXX Bill in IA on 20 Meters
AB4PP John Paul in NC on 20 Meters
AA0RQ Bill in CO on 20 Meters
W4ATL Sherman in NC on 15 Meters
K8BHG Lee in WV on 20 Meters
W7CNL Jack in ID on 20 Meters
K2DLT Duane in NY on 40 Meters
AA1MY Seab in ME on 40 Meters
WA3UMX Joe in PA on 40 Meters
KA3WTF Fran in PA on 40 Meters

I called CQ on all the other bands with no return calls.
It was a beautiful day, sunny in the low 70's but by 16:00 UTC
it was in the mid 80's and climbing.

I was using my K2 and a 66' doublet with 25 feet of 300 ohm
ladder line.

Thanks to all those who made a QSO with me and I hope to
work the other guys that I missed their calls.

72 & 73
Good DXing

Ron Polityka
de WB3AAL
wb3aal@fast.net

vvv Eastern Pennsylvania QRP Web Page vvv
<http://www.n3epa.org>
Eastern Pennsylvania QRP Club Call
N3EPA E-mail address: n3epa@fast.net

EPA QRP #1	ARRL Life Member
KL7 QRP # 309	G-QRP # 3031
ARCI QRP # 5318	10 - X #13173
NorCal	BB #35 N3EPA
ARS # 380	HI QRP #153
VA QRP Society #45	MI QRP #1703
K2 sn1392	NJ QRP #179

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 16:31:38 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <JNewell@goodwinprocter.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-

l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102072] RE: New CW testing

Message-ID: <1010609163139.QAA27536@gate.iterated.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 7/9/01 3:25 PM, Newell, John O at JNewell@goodwinprocter.com wrote:

>BTW, can someone tell me where the term "lid" comes from? I know what it
>means (I think), but have no idea why lids are called "lids."

It's an ancient telegrapher's term. Probably came from the railroad. No
idea of its origin.

Ironically, "ham" had the same meaning as "lid", originally....

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net

Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"

-- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:37:19 -0500

From: "Mike Branca" <w3irz@att.net>

To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102073] Re: REFLECTIONS II

Message-ID: <029901c108b6\$f3521f00\$fe0b4d0c@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I sent this to my friend Jerry but since a thread has started I thought my
2 cents worth would certainly help..

Jerry, my personal opinion. Maxwell is OTL. I read his book several times
and finally sold it at a hamfest. My discussions with Lew McCoy the late
W1ICP indicated the he felt that Max was full of crap too. (These were
Lew's words).

Again, just my opinion.

Mike W3IRZ

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 16:54:23 -0400
From: Fred Lesnick <flesnick@tbaytel.net>
To: FT 817 Group <FT817@yahooogroups.com>, hfpack <hfpack@yahooogroups.com>, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>, QRP Canada <qrp-canada@neale.gpfn.sk.ca>
Subject: [102074] Ten Tecs New Toy
Message-ID: <3B4A19FF.D46519E3@tbaytel.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ten Tec is also coming out with a new rig..
Check it out...

<http://www.tentec.com/TT516.htm>

Fred
VE3FAL

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 16:55:57 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102075] RE: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010709163254.009ee630@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 01:51 PM 7/9/2001 -0400, Hare,Ed, W1RFI wrote:

>Regarding conjugate matching and ARRL pubs, to answer a correspondence, I
>went to Dean Straw, N6BV, the ARRL Antenna Book editor. Here is his answer.
>
>I will add that there is no animosity between ARRL and Mr Maxwell. To the
>contrary, we have reprinted his series on "Reflections" on the ARRL TIS web
>page and are now selling Reflections II.

Thanks Ed. No argument here about the current state of affairs with W2DU and ARRL. I don't believe there ever was any issue either with the conjugate match theorem and the ARRL *Antenna* Handbook. The theorem itself has been around since the days of Dr. Everitt back in the 1930's.

But there definitely was a heap of an issue with W2DU's application of the conjugate match theorem to amplifier tank networks at the time, all of

which appeared in the ARRL Handbook (rather than the Antenna Handbook). The subject used to occupy at least 3 full pages in Chapter 16. In the 1999 Handbook there's perhaps 2 or 3 paragraphs total on the theorem and virtually no mention of it in relation to amplifier tanks. Perhaps still a little "hang over" from a few years back.

Just so we're clear, I have no knock against ARRL or the editorial staff regarding this controversy. I couldn't argue (and wouldn't either) with Maxwell or Bruene. I haven't the foggiest idea of who was right. ARRL was pushed into the position of having to do something at the time, and no doubt did what they believed was correct.

Phil

>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>ARRL Lab
>225 Main St
>Newington, CT 06111
>Tel: 860-594-0318
>Internet: w1rfi@arrl.org
>Web: <http://www.arrl.org/tis>

>

>-----

>

>Ed Hare referred your message to me. Please allow me to introduce myself
>with a snapshot resume.

>

>I was trained at Yale University (1967, BS Engineering and Applied Science)
>as an electronics engineer. I worked for 25 years in industry, both as a
>bench engineer and as a manager, in technical marketing and engineering. I
>have been the editor of "The ARRL Antenna Book" since 1993, when I first
>joined HQ staff.

>

>Although I consulted long and hard with all technical staff at HQ before
>doing so, I am the person who ultimately is responsible for removing
>"conjugate matches" from the ARRL books with which I have been associated;
>mainly "The ARRL Antenna Book" and "The ARRL Handbook."

>

>At the Dayton Hamvention this last month, I had my first opportunity to meet
>Walt Maxwell, W2DU, in-person. We discussed at some length the topic of
>conjugate matching. It was a useful and wide-ranging discussion, and I told
>Walt that we at ARRL took no "sides" on the personal controversy between him
>and Warren Bruene.

>

>The fact that ARRL has published articles and letters by both men should
>testify that we are treating each of them fairly. You may have seen the
>on-going series of articles and counter-articles by both Walt and Warren

>published in QEX over the last year or so.

>

>We are now, however, hearing from QEX readers that they are getting fed up
>with this never-ending controversy -- the same kind of messages we received
>from QST readers when that magazine became the forum some years ago for this
>conjugate-match battle. "Enough already!" is the message that is coming
>through, loud and clear.

>

>At Dayton, when Walt asked me directly why I had removed the extensive
>section on the conjugate match that he had written in earlier ARRL Handbooks
>I told him the following:

>

>1) I am a RF engineer. I have designed and worked with HF and VHF power
>amplifiers ranging from 250 mW exciters to 250 kW military SSB transmitters.

>

>2) Never, not once, did I consciously use the concept of the "conjugate
>match" to design and develop any of the above-mentioned transmitters.

>

>3) The output matching networks used in any transmitter I have worked on
>have been designed using straightforward network equations. The goal was to
>transform an output load resistance, usually 50 ohms, with a specified level
>of SWR, to the plate, collector or drain load-line resistance needed to
>develop the specified output power, at a specified level of Intermodulation
>Distortion (IMD) and at a specified level of harmonic content.

>

>4) I know of no professional (or amateur) design engineer who has ever
>consciously used the concept of conjugate matching to design a
>transmitter -- and, believe me, I have asked many of them over the years
>this direct question because of the continuing Maxwell/Bruene battle.

>

>

>Bill, for your information, you are not alone among hams when you say: "I'm
>not a Phd level mathematician and can't argue the merits of either position,
>heck I can't even understand what they are arguing about."

>

>Readers of The ARRL Antenna Book and the ARRL Handbook have expressed much
>the same sentiment over the years. They have, in essence, marveled at the
>complexity of Walt's descriptions of the wave mechanics and the conjugate
>match, but at the same time many have not found the information to be of
>much practical value. I told Walt, face-to-face: Our readers have been
>forced to "take a drink from a firehose."

>

>As an editor, I have a responsibility to our readers to present information
>that is not only technically accurate but which is also useful and practical
>to them. I told Walt that it is my opinion that there are better ways to
>describe matching networks to Radio Amateurs -- and that is the reason why
>I've removed the concept of conjugate matching.

>

>It is not that the concept of the conjugate match itself is wrong -- it is
>simply overwhelming and confusing to the average Radio Amateur. Others may
>disagree with this judgement, and I should hope that we can agree to
>disagree, as gentlemen of good will.

>

>And I agree wholeheartedly with what Walt Maxwell himself wrote in the first
>edition of his book "Reflections," on page 19-7, in section 19.3:

>

> "Until now the discussion has concentrated only on obtaining
>delivery of
>the maximum available power from a source which we have considered to be a
>classical generator. Returning for a moment to the definition of the
>conjugate match given in Beatty's item 1 (Section 19.1), we see that one of
>the conditions required for maximum absorption of power in the load is that
>the load resistance equals the source resistance of the generator. However,
>in this respect we must be aware of a crucial difference between the
>classical generator and the output circuit of a real-world RF power
>amplifier. This difference has no effect on our routine matching operations,
>but it does affect the terminology we use if we are to have a technically
>accurate description of the matching operations.

>

> The difference is this: In the classical generator, the optimum load
>resistance required for delivering the maximum available power is always
>equal to the source resistance of the generator, as required for a conjugate
>match. However, because of the complex nature of various relationships
>between voltages and currents in an RF power amplifier, during normal
>operation the internal source resistance of the amplifier, R_S , is almost
>never equal to its optimum load resistance, R_L . Hence because of the
>different values of resistance existing between the source and the load when
>we complete a matching operation, we do not have a *true* conjugate match
>when an RF amplifier is coupled to an antenna tuner or a feed line. For the
>reader who has been conditioned to believe that the routine matching
>operation achieves a conjugate match, it may be helpful to understand that,
>in reality, the tuner or feed line is matched to the *optimum load*
>*resistance* of the amplifier, but it is conjugately *mismatched* to the
>source resistance."

>

>[In the above direct quotation from "Reflections" I used asterisks (*) to
>indicate italics, since this e-mail message can't show italics.]

>

>In a nutshell, the concept of true conjugate matching doesn't hold when it
>is extended to two real-world, practical situations: (1) an RF power
>amplifier and (2) a lossy transmission line. The concept of a conjugate
>match is useful when introducing the basic concepts of wave reflections (and
>Walt Maxwell does a wonderful job in his book on this subject). But when you
>come down to practical applications of RF power amplifiers and real-world,
>lossy transmission lines, it is better to analyze things by using precise
>mathematical models.

>
>My own efforts in "The ARRL Antenna Book" and "The ARRL Handbook" has been
>to emphasize the hyperbolic transmission-line equation(s) to model
>real-world transmission lines, as embodied in my software programs TL
>(Transmission Line), TLA (Transmission Line, Advanced) and TLW (Transmission
>Line for Windows).

>
>At Dayton, I also re-affirmed to Walt that the reason why ARRL decided not
>to reprint "Reflections" was a simple economic one. The demand had fallen
>off greatly towards the end of the years we sold the book. Simply put, the
>people who wanted to buy the book had already done so and reprinting it was
>not a good economic move.

>
>I hope this explanation is useful to you. I will try to answer specific
>question you raise below.

>
>73, R. Dean Straw, N6BV
>Senior Assistant Technical Editor, ARRL
>Editor, "The ARRL Antenna Book"
>Editor, transmission line chapter, "The ARRL Handbook"

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 17:11:34 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: w3irz@att.net
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102076] Re: REFLECTIONS II
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010709170652.009f0870@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 03:37 PM 7/9/2001 -0500, Mike Branca wrote:

>I sent this to my friend Jerry but since a thread has started I thought my
>2 cents worth would certainly help..

>
>Jerry, my personal opinion. Maxwell is OTL. I read his book several times
>and finally sold it at a hamfest. My discussions with Lew McCoy the late
>W1ICP indicated the he felt that Max was full of crap too. (These were
>Lew's words).

No surprise there Mike. Maxwell's work revealed that Lew's "Ultimate Transmatch" wasn't exactly "ultimate" - it had a few problems. Lew would not have been the best choice for an unbiased opinion of this particular book.

Phil

>Again, just my opinion.

>

>Mike W3IRZ

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 16:17:42 -0500 (CDT)
From: ac5ez@webtv.net (Larry)
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [102077] Conjugate matching
Message-ID: <1406-3B4A1F76-18@storefull-117.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
Content-Disposition: Inline
Content-Type: Text/Plain; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7Bit
MIME-Version: 1.0 (WebTV)

"When the experts disagree a wise person will suspend judgement "
Bertrand Russell
Mathimatician

K1zw
Larry
Qcwa

Date: Mon, 09 Jul 2001 17:20:55 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: pcummins@misnet.com
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102078] Re: Need antenna guru help - more info concerning
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010709171412.009f8b60@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Based on this Pat, you might want to take a close look at Dr. Jerry Sevicks excellent series of articles on shortened verticals. I believe some of it is reprinted in the his books on baluns and un-uns. In his book(s) he covers the building of the test equipment he used for his own evaluations.

You also might want to have a look at ON4UN's excellent book on low band DX'ing. This book is more a theory-and-design-of-low-band-antennas-book

than it is a DX'ing book. Since low band antennas often have to be shortened to fit available space, there's lots of info on this sort of thing. Have a look sometime - it's very good.

Phil

At 01:34 PM 7/9/2001 -0500, Patrick Cummins wrote:

>Hi there

> Well a couple of you have answered my original posting with some questions. Mainly that you need some more information about what I need to do. Sorry I was vague with the first posting.

> What I am trying to do is improve my antenna system here at the qth. >Since I am running qrp power levels I thought that this would probably be >the best way to improve my signal. The qth I am at has some very stringent >physical limitations that require that I use shortened antennas. I plan to >experiment with dipoles to begin with since they are the simplest to >construct (and hopefully understand).

> Too get an idea of these restrictions, I do not have room enough to put >up a horizontal 1/2 wave dipole except on perhaps 10 and 12 meters. >Additionally I am also height restricted to about 12 feet with the antenna >about 16 feet above the ground. I am presently using a pair of mobile whip >antennas (verticals) arranged as a vertical dipole. I also don't have room >enough to install a decent counterpoise or radials for a vertical antenna, >the reason that I am using the vertical dipole. Also moving is not an option >at the present time.

> I intend to build me some measurement instruments so that I can get >quantitative data on what I do. I believe that I can construct a field >strength measurement system with which I can get at least 1db of measurement >accuracy and repeatability. I will then do things to the antenna system and >measure what the results are. What I want to be able to do is that after I >have that data to be able to explain to myself why what I did gave me the >results that I got. (Its kind of an exercise to get a better signal and at >the same time understand what is happening.) I realize that this is still >kind of vague but is the best that I can do at the present time.

> As a matter of interest I am presently studying the latest ARRL Antenna >book (which I just got) and also Moxons book HF Antennas for All Locations. >These may have the information I need but then again they may not. So I need >a good book that covers design, evaluation, and the measurement of antenna >systems, hopefully one that is not too mathematically complex. (Thus the >reference to no differential equations if possible.) I may then at a later >date look at using shortened phased array antennas in order to get me some >directivity and perhaps noise immunity.

> Thanks for the help.

>

>Patrick S. Cummins W5PSC

>pcummins@misnet.com

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:49:40 -0600 (MDT)
From: "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>
To: Mike Yetsko <myetsko@insydesw.com>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102079] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0107091546450.2309-1000000@localhost.localdomain>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

We are still using Farnsworth, it's just 15 wpm rather than the older 18 wpm. The Big change is the grading method. I liked the multiple guess way to grade the answers to the 10 questions, but that's no longer to be used. Now you must copy the names and palces and things perfect or you fail.

On Mon, 9 Jul 2001, Mike Yetsko wrote:

> Any comments now that the new CW testing protocol is in place? I
> would have thought that would generate a lot of comments.
>
> Personally, I prefer Farnsworth, but I'm not sure running at 15wpm
> for a 5wpm test is good, that may be a bit too fast.
>
> Back when I learned the code, I felt that Farnsworth (as opposed to
> a straight speed) actually was a bit easier, as the extended 'quiet
> time' gave me the ability to do a 'mental lookup' that is possible at
> 5wpm. I'd recognize the character and have that slight pause to
> figure it out.
>
> Mike
>
>
>

--
Yours Truly,

- Karl F. Larsen, k5di@arrl.net (505) 524-3303 -

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 23:52:25 +0200
From: "Stephane Collas" <Stephane.Collas@wanadoo.fr>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102080] FOC Web Site...
Message-ID: <00e201c108c1\$725d6c00\$c9c8fcc1@LTP011520>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Gang,

We have developed a new version of the FOC web site.

Please let us know what you
think about this new version.

<http://www.firstclasscw.org.uk>

73's de Steph, F5NZY
<http://www.qsl.net/f5nzy>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 16:17:38 -0600
From: "Rod Cerkoney, N0RC" <rod@n0rc.com>
To: <aa4lr@arrl.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Cc: <w5yr@att.net>
Subject: [102081] Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting
Message-ID: <004101c108c4\$f760e820\$6401a8c0@c919125b>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Bill and George make good points. After pondering on it for a while,
and considering human nature....I think next time I just reserve the
last 15-20 min. for simplex Fox Ops.

73, Rod N0RC
Ft Collins, CO

SuperFest 2001 14-Jul-2001
<http://www.qsl.net/n0rc/hamfest/hamfest.html>
BE THERE!

----- Original Message -----

From: "Bill Coleman" <aa4lr@arrl.net>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 9:28 AM

Subject: Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting

> On 7/6/01 10:33 PM, Rod Cerkoney, N0RC at rod@n0rc.com wrote:

>

> >Now, I still would like to accommodate those with simple rigs. What

> >did you think about the 10min every 30min idea?

>

> I don't know what the best solution for that would be. After all, if you

> go simplex, then those with complex rigs are going to go simplex as well,

> and then you're right back where you started from -- no one can hear the

----- Original Message -----

From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 11:59 AM

Subject: Re: FOX: On Fox Hunting

> Rod, I still suggest that you announce and observe that the last 15 or 30

> minutes of the Hunt will be devoted to calls on the Fox frequency only.

>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 18:23:05 -0400

From: "w8diz" <w8diz@fpqrp.com>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [102082] Re: FOC Web Site...

Message-ID: <012901c108c5\$ba5cfbc0\$7ecd1b41@cinci.rr.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

DAMN!!!

I guess we'll need to resurrect the SOC web site again.

72 & "oo's" - Dieter (DIZ) Gentzow - W8DIZ - Loveland, Ohio
Clermont County - EM79uf - near Cincinnati; 39.218N - 84.305W
SOC-8 DLQRPAG-1454 ARCI-10226 ARS-781 QRPL-1998 10X-9389 CATT-26
FP#-1 <http://home.cinci.rr.com/w8diz> & <http://kitsandparts.com>

----- Original Message -----

From: "Stephane Collas" <Stephane.Collas@wanadoo.fr>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 5:52 PM
Subject: FOC Web Site...

Hi Gang,

We have developed a new version of the FOC web site.

Please let us know what you
think about this new version.

<http://www.firstclasscw.org.uk>

73's de Steph, F5NZY
<http://www.qsl.net/f5nzy>

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 15:47:40 -0700
From: "blinn" <blinn@smgazette.com>
To: <myetsko@insydesw.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [102083] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <002001c108c9\$2a01e320\$dfb8e5d8@blinn>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm with you, Mike, on the Farnsworth preference. It makes so much sense.
I've been watching my grandson learn CW. Of course he prefers to send
rather than copy. And, that's the interesting part. He seems to prefer

sending with the Bug rather than keyer and forms his characters at about 12 or 15 WPM. He thinks he will be ready for the test soon. (Before his twelfth birthday!) But it's difficult to get him to sit and copy for more than five minutes at a sitting. Sending is different, he often spends an hour or so drilling me!

How are the tests formulated now-days at test sessions.. Farnsworth or regular spacing?

Bill - WA7TQK

--

Date: Mon, 9 Jul 2001 18:54:02 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: "blinn" <blinn@smgazette.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [102084] Re: New CW testing
Message-ID: <004f01c108ca\$0f886ea0\$0600a8c0@dad>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I believe Farnsworth at 15wpm character with 5wpm overall is now 'standard'. But I've read you can be 'accommodated' with straight code at 5wpm. I don't know what the procedure is to do that.

Test are now 'fill in the blank' and must be answered EXACTLY. Or, you must get a certain number of characters in a sequence correct with no errors.

Mike

----- Original Message -----
From: blinn <blinn@smgazette.com>
To: <myetsko@insydesw.com>; Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2001 6:47 PM
Subject: Re: New CW testing

> I'm with you, Mike, on the Farnsworth preference. It makes so much sense.
> I've been watching my grandson learn CW. Of course he prefers to send
> rather than copy. And, that's the interesting part. He seems to prefer
> sending with the Bug rather than keyer and forms his characters at about 12
> or 15 WPM. He thinks he will be ready for the test soon. (Before his
> twelfth birthday!) But it's difficult to get him to sit and copy for more
> than five minutes at a sitting. Sending is different, he often spends an
> hour or so drilling me!
>
> How are the tests formulated now-days at test sessions.. Farnsworth or
> regular spacing?
>
>
> Bill - WA7TQK
>
>
> --
>
>

End of QRP-L Digest 2245

